1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION		
3	* * *		
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : Case No. 1:18-cr-0043		
5	Plaintiff,		
6	- v - : Closing Arguments		
7	YANJUN XU, also known as XU : Wednesday, November 3, 2021 YANJUN, also known as QU HUI, : 9:30 a.m.		
8	also known as ZHANG HUI, : Cincinnati, Ohio		
9	Defendant. :		
10	* * *		
11	EXCERPT OF TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY S. BLACK, DISTRICT JUDGE		
12			
13	For the Plaintiff: TIMOTHY S. MANGAN, ESQ. EMILY N. GLATFELTER, ESQ. Assistant United States Attorneys		
14	221 East Fourth Street, Suite 400 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202		
15	and		
16	MATTHEW J. McKENZIE, ESQ. United States Department of Justice National Security Division		
17	950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW		
18	Washington, D.C. 20530 and		
19	JACQUELINE K. PRIM Special Assistant, Paralegal		
20	United States Department of Justice National Security Division		
21	950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, D.C. 20530		
22	For the Defendant: RALPH W. KOHNEN, ESQ.		
23	JEANNE MARIE CORS, ESQ. SANNA-RAE TAYLOR, ESQ.		
24	Taft Stettinius & Hollister 425 East Walnut Street, Suite 1800		
25	Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 and		

1		ROBERT K. McBRIDE, ESQ.
2		AMANDA JOHNSON, ESQ. Taft Stettinius & Hollister 50 East RiverCenter Boulevard
3		Suite 850 Covington, Kentucky 41011
4		and FLORIAN MIEDEL, ESQ.
5		Miedel & Mysliwiec, LLP 80 Broad Street, Suite 1900
6		New York, New York 10004
7 8	Also Present:	Mae Harman, Interpreter Robin Murphy, Interpreter Yanjun Xu, Defendant
9	Law Clerk:	Cristina V. Frankian, Esq.
		-
10	Courtroom Deputy:	Rebecca R. Santoro
11 12	Court Reporter:	M. Sue Lopreato, RMR, CRR Potter Stewart U.S. Courthouse Southern District of Ohio
13		100 East Fifth Street Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
14		513.564.7679
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

EXCERPT OF PROCEEDINGS

(In open court at 11:30 a.m.)

* * *

MR. MANGAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Before I begin, I want to thank you first and foremost for your time, your attention, and your service in this matter.

It's very much appreciated by everyone involved.

Now, I'm not going to pretend that this is a normal case. It's not. At its heart, you are asked to decide whether this man, Xu Yanjun, engaged in a conspiracy to steal trade secrets from aviation companies across the world, or whether he attempted to steal those trade secrets from GE Aviation in addition.

But it's much more than that, because this case also involves a much larger concerted effort to engage in industrial espionage, economic espionage, on behalf of a foreign country; namely, the People's Republic of China.

And the defendant in this case, as you know, is not someone who is loosely connected with some Chinese entity. He is, in fact, an intelligence officer, a spy, with China's Ministry of State Security, with the sole mission of trying to acquire whatever trade secrets he can from aviation firms by whatever means on behalf of the state.

And he used many different means and methods, and we will talk about those as we go through this. And he also had many

conspirators, coconspirators, people at MSS that you heard about already like his associates, Chen Feng, Xu Hang; his boss, Zha Rong; and his associates at AVIC that he worked with, the technical experts that helped define his requirements; friends like his card playing friends at NUAA; his university ally, Chen Feng, as well as insiders that he had planted in aviation companies, like Tian Xi and Gu Geng at Safran.

Now, the government bears the burden of proof in this case, and we gladly take on that burden because the evidence shows beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of all the crimes charged in this case.

Now I'd like to talk a little bit about these crimes and walk through the four charges that you've just been instructed on by the Court.

First and foremost, we'll talk about Counts 1 and 2, the conspiracies towards the aviation companies. Bear in mind, for Counts 1 and 2, the time period that we're talking about is from 2013 through April 1, 2018.

Count 1 is for the conspiracy to commit economic espionage, and Count 2 is the conspiracy for the theft of trade secrets, okay.

These involved all of the activities that we've discussed in this case, all of the things related to Safran, related to these exchanges, related to the overall conduct that he

engaged in during that time period. It also includes the GE incident, all right. That's Counts 1 and 2. Those are the conspiracy counts.

Again, as you heard in the instructions, it's simply an agreement, an understanding between him and others, just one other person to engage in these crimes, and then an overt act in furtherance of the crimes.

The main difference between the economic espionage and the trade secret portions, as you saw in the instructions, was that for the economic espionage charge, it talks about that this was to benefit a foreign government or a foreign instrumentality or a foreign agent.

Here you have all of those things because he was working on behalf of the MSS, along with other entities like NUAA, and certainly the government for China itself.

In contrast, the crime related to the theft of trade secrets involves an intent to injure the owner of the trade secrets, to take it from them to harm that owner of the trade secrets and benefit someone else. As you look through those instructions, that's the fundamental distinction there.

When we turn to Counts 3 and 4, there we are talking specifically about the aviation, GE Aviation incident that occurred between 2017 and April 1, 2018, that you heard so much about.

These are both attempt charges. Again, the GE incident

is included in Counts 1 and 2. But with respect to Counts 3 and 4, these are specific attempt charges related to the conduct towards GE Aviation in that time period.

Again, the distinction between the economic espionage and trade secrets has to do with was it to benefit a foreign country, did it also have the intent to injure the trade secret owner, okay?

Importantly, as you heard in the instructions, there's no requirement that it requires proof that any trade secret was lost. Again, he's charged with conspiring to commit these crimes, and he's charged with attempting to commit these crimes. It doesn't require proof that he actually acquired any specific, one specific trade secret. It also doesn't matter if the information that he was targeting --

THE COURT: Excuse me. Excuse me. I'm sorry. The interpreter has a hand up. Slow down?

THE INTERPRETER: The interpreter is asking to slow down.

THE COURT: I think I heard slow down.

MR. MANGAN: I did. I will.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. MANGAN: What I also wanted to say is that it doesn't matter if the targeted information actually was a trade secret or not. What's important is what he believed and what he intended. The question is did he target information

that he believed was a trade secret, and the answer to that question is undoubtedly yes.

Now, before I turn to the mountain of evidence in this case, one thing I want to highlight for all of you. The evidence in this case, nearly all of it, came from his own words. There's hardly another case like this. The case came directly from his own writings, his own text messages, his recordings, his pictures, his cloud, his calendar and diary. These are all his own words.

You don't have to resolve any kind of he said/she said dispute. These are his own statements, his admissions. And we all know, as a matter of human nature, that it's not uncommon for people to say things, often incriminating things, when they don't think anybody's listening or they don't think these statements will ever reach the light of day.

Well, these statements by the defendant did reach the light of day in this courtroom. And what you see in there is that it shines a light on what his deeds were, and it gives you a clear window -- his own statements give you a clear window into his intent.

Now, let's start with a fundamental question. Who is this defendant? We went through a lot of information at the beginning of the trial to piece together where the information came from so that you would be confident in the sources of the evidence and how they are all connected and tied to each

other, especially when we're dealing with his names and his aliases and the various accounts that he used.

We explained to you that there were four different phones recovered in Belgium, including the Apple 5s, which we've talked about numerous times. This was the phone that was backed up on the jastquhui@icloud, and it contained so much of the evidence you heard.

In addition, there was the iCloud backup of the phone and the iCloud account itself. All of these had chats, text messages, the calendar, the photos, the recordings. And then we also showed you a few emails from these two different email accounts, the JAST XYJ, which stands for JAST Xu Yanjun, and then the JAST Qu Hui Gmail accounts, okay?

We wanted to give you that belt and suspenders approach so that you can understand how all of these are tied together and that you had that confidence in this evidence.

Let's start with what was on him when he was arrested. First of all, there was certainly the passport, and that included the Schengen visas with his true identity on it. It showed how he went to Europe in 2017, and then again got a visa in 2018.

He also was found with that passport and the credit card, all in his true name. He was also found with his Chinese national ID card. It contains his date of birth, his national ID number, his true address back at home. These were all

found on him and identifies what his true identity is and who he is.

Now, when we start looking at the electronic evidence, we showed you the various different email accounts. If you look at those top two accounts, two email addresses. The first one set up in his own personal name, Xu Yanjun. The second one set up in his alias, Qu Hui.

Both were set up on the exact same day, five minutes apart, from the same IP address. He used the same recovery email and the same phone number. And, lo and behold, it's the same phone number that's on the phone that was on him in Belgium, and it's the same phone number that's on the business card that he gave to the GE employee in China. Same phone number, the 2316 number.

If you want more confirmation that Qu Hui is the defendant, that it's his alias, look at the last account. He sets it up in the name of Qu Hui, Qu Hui 11, and the recovery email is his true name and the year of his birth, Xu Yanjun, 1980.

As we go to the cloud accounts for those, you see, once again, the JAST XYJ email, and that again is tied to the same phone number. This is the cloud account associated with that email.

When we turn to the JAST Qu Hui cloud account, again, it describes the 5s phone that was actually recovered in Belgium.

It shows you on here, you see once again the Xu Yanjun 1980 email account he had used previously to set up a different account. Here it is tied to this cloud account.

When you go to the other subscriber information, it shows you the actual IMEI number for that 5s phone that was being backed up on the cloud, and that's where so much of this evidence came from.

It was for JAST Qu Hui's Gmail in the cloud account. The phone number matched. The IMEI number matched. On the right-hand side, you see the actual back of the phone that was recovered in Belgium so that you have confidence this is the same guy using his alias and these are his devices.

As we go forward here, we wanted to show you a lot of the things that were found in his cloud account to further help you understand the attribution. So if you weren't convinced already that these are his numbers, these are his accounts, this is why it's tied to him, look at the content of what we found.

You have in there in his true name the photo of his own national ID card that was found on him. You have pay stubs that were in there that say that he worked for the Sixth Division and had a law enforcement piece. You have a picture of a bank withdrawal form where it identifies him as working for the state security department, and it gives the same national ID number, all right, and his true name.

You even have his NUAA card, which has, again, his true Chinese national ID number, similar to our Social Security number.

Other items that were found in there, in his cloud account to help you understand this is really him, this is really his stuff, here's his medical card that was found in there. And then on the right-hand side was his MSS vacation form that he sent to his wife. And in there, it explains he's deputy division director, and he has his boss listed at the bottom, Chen Li, who we also discussed during the trial, one of the MSS supervisors.

Now, this is all to make clear how these tie together.

But who is he? Well, fortunately, he also took a picture of his resumé, his Communist party application form, which sets forth his entire history with the party and with the MSS. His current post at the time that this was taken, sometime in that 2016 time period, was a deputy division director at the Sixth Bureau for the Jiangsu Province Ministry of State Security.

And in the calendar part of it, it sets forth all of his experience, roughly 15 years, developing and being promoted within the MSS as one of their intelligence officers.

By the way, he talked about these promotions in his calendar too, and there's a lot in the calendar, as you saw.

It's more or less his diary. He talked about these promotions and his ups and downs with the MSS.

So you don't have to take our word for it. Look at the evidence. It's right there in black and white, in his own accounts, in his own words.

So let's turn to the messages. We went through these in Exhibits 32 and 33, if you want to look through them, text messages and WeChats from the defendant time and time again identifying himself, identifying his email accounts, confirming who he is and where he works.

Here again, "This is Xu Yanjun of the Provincial State Security Office and the unit of recruiting is the MSS."

Message after message we went through.

Here are two more. It says where he works, it says his true name; and, again, this is when he's talking to the insiders, when he wants to let them know he works for the MSS, because he's working with them on these operations.

Here again, more messages where he is not at all shy about who he is and that he works for the MSS.

Here's one more message, again, explaining that he works for the JSSD, which was that sub-department for the MSS.

Remember the MSS is the large organization. JSSD was the sub-organization that he worked for for the Jiangsu Province.

Then we get into the WeChats, and it's even more revealing when he talks about being in intelligence and that he works for the Sixth Bureau. It's already in the resumé, but this is just more and more evidence piling up, identifying

who he is and what he does.

In this chat with Vivian, he talks about his involvement in intelligence assessment for the ministry, and he explains the large investment that they have.

Then there's this question from her, "Does your division mostly deal with overseas?" And his answer was, "Right. Science and technology."

If you'll remember back at the very first witness, it was Dr. Mulvenon, who explained to you what the MSS was, what their purpose was. He talked about the various bureaus, and he testified he was aware that the Sixth Bureau did science and technology.

Here it is, an individual who is actually a member of the Sixth Bureau, confirming in his own words, in his own chats back in 2016, yep, that's what we do. I do science and technology.

If you remember, there was a recording of the defendant with a tutor that was found on his cloud. And when he's talking with the tutor, they get into things about all the secrets and what they can see as far as surveilling the internet. A lot of things were discussed in there, and we read those to you.

But as you'll see, one of those statements in here is that he focused on aviation. Now, you also saw that from all the evidence with respect to who he recruited and who he

contacted, it generally was people from Boeing, GE Aviation, other aviation firms like Honeywell, and so on. But to further confirm it, here he is saying it, "I focus on aviation," okay? It's right there in black and white.

Now before we move on, I want to say one word about
Nanjing Luote. You may forget the name of this company. It
came up a little bit. This was the entity that he used on his
visa applications to France. It only comes up in those two
circumstances, when he went to France in 2017 and when he went
back in 2018 to meet the GE employee. And in those two
circumstances, he told the French authorities his employer was
this Nanjing Luote Technology.

There's nothing else in the cloud, as you heard in the testimony from Agent Hull. There were no other messages, nothing that indicated he worked for Nanjing Luote; no calendar entries, no pay stubs, no identification card.

Nothing. No discussions with other Nanjing Luote employees.

All you have is when he traveled these two times, he told the French authorities that that's where he worked, and then they made up documents like the one on the right, saying that's where he had worked for many years.

But you know now, from seeing his resumé and seeing everything else, that he had been working for the MSS the whole time, and this is a lie. It's a lie to the French government. It's what he does.

You also saw the precautions document. If you recall, Mr. Olson testified about that as well. Sometimes, when they have a cover and they travel overseas, you need to study what that cover is so that everybody knows how to answer questions. And that sort of cheat-sheet precautions document was found in the cloud for his travel. And in there, it said if you need to contact anybody, you contact Chai Mung, one of his MSS colleagues.

And then during those trips, both trips, they would use codes when they chatted with each other, calling each other Tom, or Jerry, or Sam, okay, further proof that they are using their espionage trade craft when they would engage in these various excursions where they went overseas, because those were very risky for them.

But, again, all of the evidence you see that we presented here proves that he was an MSS officer. That was his primary function. That was his job. Everything else is an alias, or a cover, or a front.

Let's talk about the aliases, mostly the Qu Hui one that you see there. He used these aliases. This is part of the deception that goes with his job title, that goes with his job duties.

Take that into consideration when you consider his intent, okay. He is hiding his MSS affiliation when he deals with outsiders because he doesn't want them to know that the

MSS is behind these exchanges, that they are behind these operations.

Look at what he's hiding when you consider his intent.

To do his job, this was the card obviously that he handed to the GE employee. It was part of this alias that he used fairly consistently with a number of these exchanges, especially when he dealt with outsiders, people that weren't, you know, either at AVIC, or at NUAA, or at MSS, okay?

Here it's very clear he sends a message to someone, saying, "Teacher Zhang, my working identity is Qu Hui, deputy secretary general of the Jiangsu Province Foreign Science and Technology Association. Thanks." And then he signs it with his true name. He calls it his working identity.

And remember, you heard from Mr. Mulvenon, Mr. Olson how the MSS does use science and technology associations as covers, as fronts for some of their operations. It happened throughout this case, you saw in the evidence.

But look at this right here. Remember back in the opening statements -- and I know our opening statements aren't evidence, but the defense mentioned to you that he works for Nanjing Luote, and maybe sometimes for the MSS, and who knows who Qu Hui was.

They made that statement. "Who knows who Qu Hui is?"

You know who he is. He just told you. He tells you over and

over again in the evidence. He's Xu Yanjun. This is his

working identity. This is my alias. This is the lie I'm using. Let's get it straight so that you call me by the right name when we're trying to dupe these foreigners.

So when they talk about who knows who Qu Hui is, is that what you saw in the evidence? Because the evidence was very clear. It's his alias. It is this defendant.

Mr. Zheng, from GE Aviation, went to meet Qu Hui, got the business card. He stood here in the courtroom and pointed at him. "That's him. I met him. That was the guy who said he was Qu Hui," who you know as Xu Yanjun.

Here you have one of the examples, one of many examples in the evidence where he's introducing himself to the outsiders as being part of JAST. This is part of the deception. It's part of the luring and the recruiting. The whole idea is to bring people back under these false pretenses, lull them into some sense of comfort that this is normal, this is aboveboard, there's nothing underhanded here. You certainly can't tell them you work for the MSS.

It's part of the scheme. It's how they try to get the technology. This is part of the con. That's what it is. It's a con.

Let's look at a job posting that he does over at -- he reaches out to one of the professors and wants to do a job posting for JAST, and he tells the professor, Hey, don't tell them -- don't reveal our security agency background when you

notify the students. Just put the posting under the JAST name.

So he's acknowledging we used it as a front. Don't tell the students. But in the contact portion, when the students want to apply, this is who they contact; same phone number, same email address, same defendant who is sitting here today.

Now, there is one other alias. This was admitted in the evidence, and I know we read a lot to you. We read a lot.

And I appreciate your patience. We didn't actually read these exhibits. This was Exhibits 94 to 98. You're welcome. We didn't read all of those to you. You may think we read everything. It felt that way, but this was something we didn't cover.

I'm going to just comment on it briefly, but you can go take a look at 94 through 98. There was another individual at Boeing that was recruited over for exchanges, an engineer named Linda Li. And with Linda Li, you'll see in the messages with her that the defendant reached out to her under a different alias called Zhang Hui or Zhang Hui.

Even for this one, he set up a LinkedIn profile under this name. If you'll look at the email address that set it up, it's jastxyj@gmail.com. And when she came over for the exchanges, he had to reach out to his coconspirators and let them know the alias he was using.

So here again, similar to what you saw in other

instances, he's telling the dean for this exchange, Hey, I'm Zhang Hui, deputy director over at this science and technology association, so everybody can get on the same page. Then he sends the same thing to two more people. Hey, here's the identification I'm using.

Remember this is coming from the defendant on his own communication platforms on this phone that we've already talked about.

This kind of deception is second nature for him. It was part of the job. It comes with being an officer in the MSS, and it comes with trying to lure these people over to get their technology. Again, understanding what he's hiding helps you understand his intent.

Let's turn to the exchanges themselves. We talked about those a lot. The aliases, these fronts and covers were part of bringing the folks over. These, again, were the opening steps to bringing folks over and trying to soften them up, recruit them, and find out how they might be best used by the MSS in order to acquire the technology they want.

The true purpose was to lure them and obtain trade secrets. We looked at the recruitment cycle. First, there was a spotting. As you heard, they would reach out, oftentimes through LinkedIn, as a way to identify the person in the right company with the right expertise. That certainly happened in the GE scenario.

Oftentimes, they would use a person as a front person to make the first invitation, like they did with Chen Feng and the GE Aviation employee -- that's part of that spotting process -- and then inviting them over.

Then when they bring them over, they do the wining and dining. They take them out for a couple meals. They get to know who they are. Maybe they do a presentation to students. This is all part of the assessment phase.

As you heard, this is part of the recruitment cycle for an espionage officer. They're assessing them. They're trying to learn as much as they can, find out what they know and how they can help the MSS.

They pay them cash. They'll pay for sightseeing.

They'll take them around, all right, all under false names,

false covers, so that the person doesn't know. And, by the

way, maybe they brought their work computer. But we'll come

back to that.

As you saw, he did this many times with Arthur Gao. He did it with the individual at Boeing who did the IT, Sun Li, Linda Li. It goes on and on.

Now, one of the examples we showed you was this individual named Bin Liang, and he was a person who had worked for one of the aviation companies. Again, the alias was used.

He brought them over. He offered to help the parents of the individual with the demolition issue in China, which,

again, was part of how they tried to leverage things in China to help get some cooperation, and brought the person around for sightseeing and presentations.

And, again, as you saw at the bottom there, once again,
"The guest doesn't know our identity. I approached him in the
name of Qu Hui," okay? So we see it over and over again
between them.

Ask yourself -- and we do rely on your common sense. It's in the instructions. Apply your common sense. Ask yourselves, why are they using this deception? If you're simply trying to get public information, if you are on the up-and-up, if you have legitimate reasons for what you're doing, you don't do this stuff.

It's all part of the developing of sources. What are the options once they get them? Well, we'll talk about that a little bit more here with Arthur Gao; but, obviously, once they bring them over and they get them developed, there are options. They can keep asking them back. They can try to get more information. They can even break into their hotel room and take their computers; a lot of options at this point.

Now, you heard about Arthur Gao. He was originally recruited by Zha Rong, who was using an NUAA alias at the time. They brought him back in 2016, and that's when he was handed from Zha Rong over to the defendant, Xu Yanjun.

They met at that point. No presentation. They just took

him sightseeing, paid for everything. And when he left, they gave him \$5,000 in cash and said why don't you come on back.

All right. They were just planting the seeds, trying to make sure they had started to get their hooks in him and slowly get him going.

But what really was interesting was when he came back in 2017. He gave a presentation, and the substance of the presentation, it's in the transcript, but what was interesting was that the whole meeting was recorded.

And when Arthur Gao left -- and he testified here, Nobody asked me specifically for any trade secrets. Not that that's the words they're going to use anyway, but what he didn't know is what they were going to say about him after he left, and what Xu was going to say about his overall process after he left. That's what's really interesting in this.

As you look at this recording -- and he talked about how he works with these experts when you bring them over. Again, think of this in terms of the recruitment cycle.

As he went through these, he walked through -- he tells you exactly what his process is. At the highest level, these experts can participate in long-term design. But there's a problem with this because of the time commitment. They can't simply leave their jobs, and they may not want to leave their jobs or the U.S. and come back to China and become an actual developer for China.

So another option is to present specific problems or programs to the person about the problems encountered and see if they can help China fix some of those problems.

But the big one that he uses the most, probably, is asking the experts -- and by "experts," he's talking about people that work for aviation companies in the U.S. and in Europe, all right. These are insiders in aviation companies that they are luring back.

One of their main options, and something he says they did frequently, was to try to get them to provide information directly, okay? And he talks about the volume of information is hard, and they have a lot of challenges with this; but, most importantly, it's right here.

"As experts abroad, it's very difficult for them to directly take materials, large batches of materials from abroad, due to the fact that their company security is tight."

And he talks about the risk they bear before he gets cut off.

Look, he gives away his intent here, okay? There's no statement here about we respect the security of these companies. This is an obstacle for him. This is something he wants to circumvent and get around, and he needs to try to find people on the other side that will look at it the same way.

Again, this is a problem. The way it's difficult for them is because sometimes the security is tight for this

information. Remember the definition of trade secrets:

Information that a company has taken reasonable precautions to keep secret and that they derive some economic benefit from that being kept secret.

That's really all we're talking about with trade secrets. It's not magical. And here, when he talks about it in the context that he never thought was going to be played in an American courtroom, here he is talking about it. "Large batches of materials, it's hard to take because the company's security is tight." He's not backing off from it. It's just a problem they need to overcome. He still wants that information. He still intends to get those trade secrets.

Now they do talk about Arthur Gao, how they can still use him. And they mentioned even, well, maybe he can get information because his company's bankrupt. They seem to think that's sort of an opening for him. Mr. Gao didn't know any of this, of course. He didn't know how he might be used in the future; and, fortunately, he never made it back there before this defendant was arrested.

They also talk about spotting, that he can contribute to other things, like introduce other experts for us. So here's some more talking about spotting. We saw it on the recruitment cycle.

And Mr. Xu, the defendant, talks directly about how he targets people. It's not simply the technology. If they tell

him, Hey, we need composite fan blade technology, he needs to know the company. And we'll get to that. There's one company. It's GE Aviation.

He wants to know the company, and then he can look, whether it's LinkedIn or somewhere else, and start burrowing down to the person with the right specialty, the right access, and then that's who he looks for.

And he says it right here, all right? We're not asking you to, you know, come up with this out of some other circumstances. It's right here in his admissions. He's trying to find the company, and then he tries to identify the person.

He also goes on to talk at length about funding. And what is made abundantly clear is that there are no limits here, that there is abundant funding for this.

And the very last statement at the bottom is maybe the most telling, "As for money, for our state, the funding for the aviation field is not a problem," right?

So he has all these tools at his disposal. The main goal, though, is to get trade secrets. This is not a discussion you are having about trying to do open source, public research on the internet, okay? This is what you're talking about when you're talking about operations, intelligence operations.

Again, he goes on and on, talking about the funding. He

even mentions if somebody can give him a serial number and he can find the document, he's willing to spend the money to buy it, okay?

And you saw with these exchanges there's plenty of cash thrown around. With Arthur Gao, they gave him five grand in 2016 just to come back. When he came back, gave a presentation, they gave him another pile of cash and paid for his trip back.

They do talk about the state function, as I mentioned in the economic espionage portion. There's certainly a part of this where one of the elements is that they're doing these crimes on behalf of or for the benefit of a state entity, which would include MSS. But here, it's right here.

If you want to check the box on this element, go right to this statement: "Talk about the truth. With that said, we are serving the state." Period. End of story. That's what he's doing. That's his job. That's his mission.

Now, one of the portions of the recording, he happens to talk about originally looking for a fan blade. So I wanted to point out the timing of this.

When we get to the GE function, the GE employee's invited there and gives his initial presentation in June of 2017. A few months later, we have Arthur Gao coming back for his round two.

Then you get this recording, and he makes this comment.

And then shortly thereafter is when the FBI goes and intervenes with the GE employee, and then they reach out. Within seven, eight months, April 1st, the defendant is arrested.

These overlap. That's the main point I wanted to get to, that you understood that the timing of this recording showing his intent is in the middle of and as the GE incidents are going on. It's over the same time period.

He then goes on and talks some more about Mr. Gao, how we've got some options for how we can use this guy, that he seems willing. You know, Arthur Gao doesn't know what they have in store for him, but they have a plan. The question is what method they want to use for execution. You see that at the bottom. They want to design something for him and make use of what he knows.

And sure enough, in January of that year, it was around the same time he's starting to make plans to meet with the GE employee, they send a tasking to Arthur Gao, where they did ask for information, more detailed information. So they are continuing down that path of trying to develop him as a source and extract information.

The other interesting thing after that meeting was this particular phone call that he has with Chai Meng. And Chai Meng is everywhere. We're going to talk about him a lot. He's in Safran. He's in the GE case. He was with Arthur Gao.

He was in the picture. That's him, the tall guy on the left, meeting with Arthur Gao and taking him sightseeing.

And after the meeting, you get the call from the defendant saying, Hey, you used the wrong alias. It's hard when you're lying. It's hard to keep them straight. These things happen.

And right here, he goes through it and he explains, You said you were with the foreign affairs office of NUAA.

Remember, that was the lie that Zha Rong had used for him and Xu. But he wanted him to use the JAST alias, which, by the way, Chai Meng's alias Cai, C-a-i, and Mr. Gao said, Yeah, this was the guy, C-a-i, that's how they introduced him to me. The tall guy was called the secretary.

That alias was on the JAST website, Cai Meng, right next to his alias, Qu Hui, on the JAST website, until after he was arrested, and then they pulled the alias down.

But it's interesting here. It definitely reveals very clearly what they are doing. This is the inside stuff. One spy talking to another, saying, Hey, you messed up. You used the wrong alias when we were talking to the target. Let's clean it up tomorrow.

One other thing before we move on here. You saw how Mr. Xu talked with people at places like AVIC to help define requirements, also evaluate the information that he was collecting.

We introduced a number of those communications between him and individuals at AVIC. I won't go through all of those, but one of the parts of it that was interesting was their use of codes. And you also saw their use of -- their discussions regarding not just commercial aviation technology, but military aviation technology.

The efforts of Mr. Xu and his coworkers at the MSS to steal aviation technology extended into that realm, and they certainly did have an impact on those interests. They used codes in discussing military technology. You see in this exchange where he passes along the various codes from his MSS associate to one of the AVIC associates.

You recall he talked about seeing plans or getting plans for the U.S. F-22 fighter aircraft. They also made a reference to another aircraft. The U.S. aerial refueling aircraft, the KC-135, which he talks about right here in one of his messages to AVIC.

This reinforces what you heard is that the number one goal for MSS and for his group was to get aviation technology, and that certainly bled over into information of what might be military technology, which certainly even more so is going to be protected and guarded as trade secret.

I alluded to the issue with computer hacking, and we got a lot to talk about there, so let's turn to it.

So with respect to computer hacking, these exchanges were

the beginning of the process to recruit sources. They would bring the individuals over and, from that point, they have a lot of different ways to use them.

If the person actually became an insider and became an asset within a company like Safran, then they could use them in even more aggressive ways.

The hacking of Safran is the crystal clear example of how an intelligence operation like the one he operated could use a HUMINT asset inside of a company to help with acquiring trade secrets from an aviation company by planting malware on one of the employee's networks.

The messages -- and there's a lot in here, and we'll go through them all, but please go back and reread the summary of the Safran intrusion in Exhibit 110. It walks through it from beginning to end, where he talks with his insider.

Remember the Safran employee came here from France to testify, and he explained that he went to Suzhou, which is the area in China where they had their particular plant with their subsidiary, and he met with -- he worked with Tian Xi, one of the main managers at the plant. They worked side by side, and he didn't know this guy was betraying him the whole time. And the reason he was betraying him is because he was a working inside asset for an MSS spy, Xu Yanjun.

They talked about when they're going to meet, when the Frenchmen are arriving so that he can set up times to meet,

okay? They go on and on and talk about when they're going to get together.

As you go on, he even talks about, Hey, if we can meet at the restaurant, I'll pretend to bump into you at the restaurant. That way, we don't have to meet elsewhere. And they try to make those types of covert arrangements.

Now, eventually, they get to where he talks about where they're staying, and he tells them the Crowne Plaza. If you remember, Mr. Hascoet testified that when he would go there, that's where they stayed. They stayed at the Crowne Plaza.

This is going through November, and they're having some frustration. They didn't quite get where they wanted to be, and he asked the question of Tian Xi, "Horse hasn't been planted?"

Now, you heard the testimony from Adam James, the special agent, about what a remote access Trojan was, and that this is a term for that kind of malware, that kind of remote access Trojan horse malware that can be planted on somebody's computer. Again, they talk about how they haven't found an opportunity to plant the horse.

As it moves on, we get into January, and he starts talking with a different asset he has. Remember Gu Geng was an IT specialist within Safran, another insider that he had planted in the company.

He talks about how Gu has told him that Safran heard that

people were posing as company leadership and sending out letters. This is a different scheme going on. And here he talks with his associate, Chai Meng, about, Hey, is this us? You know, is this another part of the MSS operation? And they're back and forth about, you know, here's what we did, what we didn't do, okay.

This is kind of -- it's almost a side route from the planting of the malware, but it shows the other activities they were engaged in.

But then January 25th, it finally happens. He sends the message to Xu -- this is one coconspirator to another -- about an overt act, saying, "The horse is planted. This morning."

Okay. And "the horse" is the malware.

And you heard from Agent James that that was the day when they analyzed Frederic Hascoet's computer. That was the day that the malware was installed -- two different types of malware were installed on his computer.

He explained the horse is planted, the IP address is now online, and the MSS is off and running. They have now hacked into a Safran employee's computer with the help of this defendant. Then the next day he tells them, "Destroy the horse," and his agent acknowledges.

They go on, and you see more conversations with, eventually, you know, this is only in effect for a few weeks before there was a public report, and that led to the

discovery of this malware, and eventually Safran was sort of at least on to it and started to take actions to fix this hacking.

As they go through it, they start talking about -fighting a little bit about what's going on. Here the insider
IT guy, Gu Geng, is told to check out this particular record,
the dmsdojo.com. If you recall from Agent James, that was the
website that the malware was designed to beak in to.

So you can see the company has figured out this is part of the problem, and our inside conspirators who are committing this crime are talking about, hey, they're on to us, they're checking out this particular record. And here he is checking with his other MSS associates about it.

Then you just see a number of things where they -- Xu is, again, checking with individuals, trying to find out if anybody's on to them, trying to see if they got caught.

Bear in mind, you don't do this operation, you don't go through this kind of work to put malware on a computer for public information, okay? All right. They may say, Well, look, they weren't -- the computer didn't show whether or not things were extracted. They couldn't tell one way or another whether or not they successfully extracted documents from there. But the point is they put a tool on there, they put malware, two types, on there that was designed to extract documents from that computer.

And remember who Safran is. Safran is in a joint venture with GE. They make the LEAP engine. They have a factory, obviously, over in China, where they're working on some parts, but that is the technology that they are trying to acquire.

They don't have an engine of their own yet that they can put on a plane. Right now they're designing a plane, the C919, and the engine they're putting on it is the LEAP engine. They're using the Safran GE engine right now.

So, yes, this is who they're targeting, another aviation company, trying to get after one of their employees to exploit that company and get around their security measures to get into the company, okay?

No indication this is domestic surveillance. There's no evidence of that. There's no statements about that kind of stuff. They're trying to get in to and exploit a particular computer for an aviation company that is a target.

There's no way they're going through all this expense, this whole operation planting this horse because they want to get the invitation list to the Christmas party, all right?

They're going after the crown jewels. They need to get in and find more about this technology.

If we look on, they get to the end of this, and it says, "No new news. Should be an unsolved mystery." "Ho ho."

Now, bear in mind, it was an unsolved mystery for a long time, for four years, until the defendant's arrest and these

messages were discovered. You saw that Gu Geng and Tian Xi were terminated in 2018 by Safran once this information was discovered.

Bear in mind, if you go back to the cadre form, he did well in 2014. They were proud of the work he did. That happened to be the same year that he got the malware planted in Safran.

But the hacking doesn't end there. If you turn forward and you start talking about -- there's Sun Li who came and testified. He was the IT person at Boeing, and he went back and forth about how they contacted his parents, they recruited him to come over.

And he kept telling them, I don't do the network security. I do something else at Boeing. But bear in mind, he's not an engineer. He's not going to be invited over for a presentation with the AVIC professors or anything like that, okay?

So why did they want to get ahold of him? Well, it makes sense when you think of Gu Geng and Safran. If your job is to get aviation technology from foreign companies and steal that, you either need to work with the engineers or an IT person inside. And they certainly went after that with Sun Li and reached out to him.

And after they met with him -- remember he said he met with a person named Cai in the hotel lobby, and they kept

trying to pay for his trip. They kept pushing him. He's like, You don't need to pay for my trip. But they kept saying how they reached out to his dad, and there's pressure applied. There's definitely pressure applied.

There's another one in the evidence here, Exhibit 93b, where he reaches out to a Honeywell employee; and, again, he's asking about their network security for the same reason. This fits with Safran. This fits with what he's doing with Boeing. He's trying to get ahold of IT people within aviation companies because his goal is to get into their platforms. And the only reason you want to do that is because you're trying to get trade secret information.

The last part of the hacking is what he does with some of the guests that came over for these exchanges. And as you saw in there, this was called the "Eighth Division Apply Techniques."

The foreign folks would come over. One of the examples we showed you was Li Jiang from 2014. Here they applied the techniques. It says, "The laptop was not turned off.

Therefore, it could only work on the hard drive." And he apologizes and says, "Sorry for troubling you this time."

But they meet with him again. They talk about how, Hey, the expert doesn't know my true identity. I approached them under the name of the JAST. Don't mention the materials. All right.

So what happens after that? They have another meeting in December 2014. This is from his calendar. It's from the defendant's own calendar in the cloud. It says how they brought Li Jiang to Nanjing, and Zha held a banquet, and they applied the techniques. And what were the chats that happened during that? That's how we know what it means by "Eighth Division Apply Techniques."

It goes through and talks directly about how they're working on the laptop computer, one portable hard drive, two small drives. They brought him back to the hotel for him to start dinner with Zha Rong. And then while they're doing that, they are up in the hotel ripping off the guy's computer.

It goes on, saying, "Copying the entire thing needs three hours." And his boss, who is down there at dinner, says, "Speed it up. That's too long."

They go on and talk about how they're done -- if we go back, they talk about how they're almost done, and they will restore the scene. "Restoring the scene" meaning they're going to clean up the hotel room that they just broke into and get it back to where the person doesn't suspect that we just ripped off what was in his computer. This is what they did here in this occasion for one of the guests that they invited over from an aviation company.

Now, there's one other example we sent in, talking about how in April 2014 there was another individual who came for an

exchange, the Eighth Division Apply Techniques. That's the defendant's own words. And you see later on he has a message from where he has to tell his boss that the guest has it turned off, all right?

So it's pretty clear what's going on here. Not some kind of -- you know, there's no explanation for this, other than they're recruiting, they're targeting these aviation employees, bringing them over, and this is one of the methods, one of the techniques that they can use to get the information that they want.

Now I'm going to turn to the GE portion of it here. But I want to at least mention, for Counts 1 and 2, what we've talked about already in terms of the recruiting of the guests, these exchanges, the Safran incident, the hacking in the hotel rooms, you know, trying to use these compu- -- the exchanges to get into IT people, all of this process, the whole recruiting process that he describes in detail in the Gao recording, this is enough for Counts 1 and 2.

Counts 1 and 2 is proving a conspiracy to steal trade secrets, both economic espionage or trade secrets, for Counts 1 and 2. You've already got enough before you even get to the GE portion.

Now, the GE portion is definitely part of Count 1 and 2, and that's what I'm going to turn to, but I want to make clear to you that you may already be convinced that there is enough

there to convince you of those crimes before we even get to the events of 2017 and 2018 with GE.

But let what we just talked about, how he operates, all the lies, the deception, inform how you think about what happened with GE. Now that you know how he operates, and who he is and what he does, that should color everything you see in that whole exchange regarding the GE side of things.

Now let's talk about this. Up in Dayton, you know, not far from here, a long time ago, a couple of brothers invented airplanes, all right? They did so with their own hard work, their own innovation, their own brainwork, all right?

And then up the road in Evendale, not far from here, is GE Aviation, and they continue on that tradition of innovation, of great technological advancement when it comes to jet engines.

As you heard, to build a competitive engine, it needs to be light, it needs to be durable. And one of the key components for GE Aviation engines is the use of composite fan blade technology and composite cases.

What GE is able to do by building this kind of mold, this very complex mold, and use lightweight composites to make these fan blades, it makes them lighter. They're stronger. They last longer. They require less maintenance.

By being lighter, it means the whole plane's lighter.

They can fit more people on the plane, or they can go further.

It's more money for the aircr- -- you know, for Delta, or whoever is running the aircraft. It's more fuel efficient, all right? It makes them the leader; the leader in the world.

And other companies have tried. They have tried to develop similar or competing technology. They talked about how Rolls-Royce, you know, has tried. They tried once before and nearly bankrupted themselves. Now they're trying again. They've got one in development, hasn't been certified, is not on a single plane.

So for the last 20 to 30 years, if you want an engine with composite fan blades, there's only one show. It's GE. So for China, whose goal is to develop their own plane, some day develop their own engine so that they don't have to buy all of this stuff from foreign companies, they need to figure out how to do the same thing.

And so composite fan blade technology is a very logical, understandable target for them. And they certainly did it in this case.

What you cannot deny is that even as other folks have tried to develop the same technology, it takes time. It takes years. It takes millions of dollars. Even if someone can acquire some of the technology and shave off that time and save some of that money, it is of huge benefit to a competing entity so even a little piece helps.

They have tried to pour -- competitors have tried to pour

money into this and develop a similar thing; but, at the end, the GE technology still stands alone. It doesn't have a competitor that actually is on the market.

So if this person's job is to get trade secret information from aviation companies, and you need to get a fan blade, a composite fan blade, well, there's only one target for you, and that's GE.

So sure enough, they look on LinkedIn, they do their spotting, they do their assessing, and they identify Dr. Zheng, the GE employee that came in here and testified.

And you know the whole story; how they recruited him, how they first got him to come over for the initial visit. They used a proxy, Chen Feng, to recruit him.

He suggested the topics for the meeting. Got him to come on over. They go forward from there. Again, when he's there, he decides to come over, and one of the things we point out is in that exchange with Chen Feng, as he's getting ready to come over, at one point the GE employee doesn't respond quick enough, and then you get this email from jastxyj saying, "Did you receive the earlier email? Please confirm." And he signs it "Chen Feng," all right?

But this is Xu Yanjun jumping into the picture because he knows -- you know, he's behind this. Sure enough, he comes over for the visit and does the presentation in June of 2017.

Again, they meet multiple times. He meets -- obviously,

he meets him under the alias, doesn't use his true name.

Introduces him to another MSS person, Director Ji. They have tea, lunch, dinner, do the presentation, give him cash, send him on his way, all right? Fortunately, he didn't bring his company computer.

And if you go back and look at the calendar references, it shows Chai Meng met with him the day before, met with Xu the day before to talk about this meeting.

Now, one thing to keep in mind, and this goes for Dr. Zheng, Mr. Gao, some of the deception, you need to understand how they talked with their own companies. He didn't tell GE he was going over there. Same thing with Mr. Gao.

Folks like this, they get recruited over. Whether they know exactly who they're dealing with may not be clear.

Obviously, they do get lied to, but they lie to their companies. They didn't tell them about the trips. They didn't tell them they're getting paid in cash.

Why they do it, there may be a lot of reasons. It could be ego. It could be money. It could be some desire to help the old homeland. It could be pressure. It could be just disgruntled. But bear in mind -- and we don't want sympathy to be any part of this -- there could be a lot of motivations for what's going on here on both sides of this; not just Xu, but the people he's recruiting over.

His job is to seduce them and exploit them, exploit whatever emotions they have, slowly, and then you can see how it worked.

Now, in the operation, as you heard, they found -eventually, the FBI went and interviewed Dr. Zheng and
convinced him to cooperate. He did this with, obviously, you
know, his counsel.

I think in the opening, the defense talked about "they broke Dr. Zheng." You can decide -- you saw him testify -- if you saw anything that indicated that.

There was testimony from him, from the FBI agent. They treated him politely. They even looked after his own security. There was no evidence of that. He was simply confronted, and he decided to cooperate. Any discussion of breaking Zheng is just a red herring.

So let's turn to the actual communications. At that point, the FBI reached back out to Chen Feng. Well, actually before that. Obviously, he had said thank you. So they reach back out to Chen Feng to connect with him again, and then Chen Feng does the handoff to Mr. Xu, and they're off and talking with Mr. Xu, okay?

So as we go through this, you'll see that they talk about when he can come back. And we get to this point where in this message, Mr. Xu states -- and we're in January 9, 2018, he states, "He will see what technology is desired and let you

know what to prepare. For your end, please prepare the plane ticket," and explains the rest of it, and then chides him to pay more attention to WeChat, okay?

So note, he does let him know that he will tell him what to prepare so, obviously, the GE employee asks what he should bring. There were communications about should I bring this, should I bring that, until we get to his communication about a week or so later, when Mr. Xu, still using his alias, says, "Right now there's nothing for you to prepare on my end."

But then the message after that is -- excuse me. Is a few days -- actually, a week or so later, the message from the GE employee mentions speculation about laying off in his department.

And as you heard from the testimony, there were layoffs. There were public reports, if Xu wanted to confirm that in the news. There were press reports that there were layoffs at the time. So he indicates that he's concerned about that, and that's why he's trying to collect.

So immediately, for an MSS officer, that shortens the time period and puts a little bit of urgency. And we definitely see a change in what Mr. Xu does from this point forward.

He tells him right there, "Okay. Try your best to collect, and we can talk by then."

And then he says, "Domestically, there is more focused on

the system code." All right. That's a collection target. That's tasking.

As we go to the next slide, he clarifies, "What exactly do you mean?" Xu gives him a clarification of what he means, "The system specification and design process." And he gives him an email to send it to.

Again, this is tasking. This is trying to get your target to start collecting information for you, just like Mr. Olson testified.

As we get into this, let's take a look at this message right here. You heard once again from the defendant, where he said, "It might be inappropriate to send directly from the company," right?

Again, company security is just a nuisance. It's an obstacle for him to circumvent, and he's looking for somebody who is willing to do that with him. So it's right here that he is targeting information he believes would be trade secrets because he knows there's company security. He wants to get around it.

He gives him a new email to help circumvent the process.

And then they move on to where the GE employee sends a slide;

and, again, GE came and told you that they had changed some of
the information on here to make sure they weren't revealing
anything too sensitive, but it does indicate it's proprietary,
and he sends this along, saying "is this what you mean by the

system code" to help clarify what was already asked for, what was already demanded by the defendant, Xu.

What's really interesting is what happens after this.

Two emails right in a row on -- as we get into the May 5th time period. He sends this email where he says, "Here are the domestic requirements that I know of. Can you take a look and let me know if you're familiar with those."

All right. Remember from Mr. Olson, where he talked about you meet with the experts, you define the requirements of what you need. Intelligence officers don't waste their time looking for stuff that's public. They may use that to define what the requirements are, but what they are trying to do is figure out what they don't have, what is not public that they need.

And so he goes and gets requirements from the experts in China, and he delivers them here in an email to the GE employee. He even calls them domestic requirements.

This is a complete hallmark of an intelligence operation, and they're clearly tasking him to get into something that is trade secret.

Let's go to the actual requirements. You heard Mr. Kray from GE testify about these. What he told you was these are pretty good questions. These are pretty good questions.

They're looking at stuff that if you answered these questions, if you got into the information behind this, yes. Yes,

absolutely, you would be getting into GE trade secret information.

So did the defendant ask for trade secret information?

Yep. It's right here in an email. He even calls it domestic requirements. They didn't even bother to change some of the language. It's written asking for "foreign countries structural materials of rotor fan blades" all right.

They know they're targeting foreign technology. They didn't even bother to change the language in their document when they sent it over to him. They wanted to know foreign countries' composite material rotor fan blade details.

And a lot of this stuff, when you start getting into prepreg, which is the material that they use, and then all these different tolerances, how they put together the composite, the orientation of it, that's some of the secret sauce. And Mr. Kray said, "These are good questions. They are getting at it. They are really getting at what we do."

That was on February 5th. That wasn't the only thing he sent. He sent a second email same day. By the way, at this point, all that was sent to him was just saying, Hey, I might be laid off, so this is a good time for me to collect. That's all that happened.

At arrest, he took over. He was the aggressor. He is the one going after it. Sends these two emails. One with the domestic requirements where he is directly targeting "here are

the questions, we need answers" regarding GE's trade secret technology.

Then he makes a more aggressive statement, saying, "Here are the instructions. Can you download a directory of your GE work computer?" He gives those directions to the GE employee.

At this time, they're still trying to talk about going to China. Obviously, Mr. Xu thinks he's got a good, willing source inside GE. He's asked for information that is trade secret technology.

If you have any doubt about that, you can look at this email, where he's told, Hey, the stuff you're asking about, because the involvement of GE intellectual property and commercial secret, such as the previous email I sent to you, he's put on notice many times.

The actual email that sent that slide had the word "proprietary" on it. He comes up with his own list of questions, which does target trade secret information. Then he's told in a message, Hey, what you're asking for is getting into our IP, our proprietary trade secret information or commercial secret information.

Did you see him slow down? Does he back off? No. Not at all. This doesn't -- again, these are the -- he's blowing through these stop signs. You know, this is just stuff for him to get around. He thinks he's got a target, a willing

target insider, and he's looking to exploit it. He thinks the door's open a crack, and he's trying to bust it down.

So we get into this. He says regar- -- he emails back,
"Hey, regarding your concerns, let's just talk about it when
you get back to China." Kind of blows him off there and moves
on.

Again, he still thinks he's coming back to China. So at this point, the GE employee backs off. And this is the FBI operation, all right? I think it was made clear by the agent, this is Agent Hull sending these messages, you know, as the GE employee.

He sends the messages and says, "Hey, sorry. I can't come back. I've got to go to France for work." He did not invite him to France. He did not tell him anything else. He just says, "Sorry, I'm not coming to China." Period. Okay.

Then he also says, "You asked for the directory. I'll get you the directory." Okay. All right. And they talk about maybe they can meet some time in the future.

But he says, "I know you asked for the directory. I'll send it over," okay?

So after we go through the process, I think you heard that described, how GE went through the process of actually compiling a real directory off of Dr. Zheng's computer and then went through and deleted what they needed to to protect their own information. That was provided to the FBI, and they

were able to send it over.

This is sent on Valentine's Day, February 14th. Okay.

Up to this point, he had been pushing, pushing, pushing. Then he finds out, oh, he's not coming to China. Then he gets a directory.

And all the sudden, Hey, let's meet in Europe. Suddenly, Xu is the one pressing to meet him somewhere else. Says obviously he's not going to meet you in the U.S., but he wants to see if you're visiting any other countries and wants to see if there's a way where they can still meet.

Obviously, the director, he has whetted his appetite. He thinks he's got an insider who's willing to give him information; and, again, he is trying to exploit it and get whatever trade secrets he can.

Same day he sends all those messages, he sends an email. This is a pretty anxious person at this point. He wants to know, "Hey, when are you coming back? By the way, I've got some questions about the directory" that he asks at the bottom, all right?

You get the response back. The GE employee doesn't commit to any of this. It was never suggested that he meet with him in Europe. This was all Mr. Xu pushing, pushing, pushing.

He continues to try to press for details to see if he can meet; and, again, the GE employee deflects, you know, kind of

backs off, plays a little bit hard to get.

So he talks about trying to -- you know, can you please make the arrangements. This is Xu telling him make the arrangements so that he can make his own, all right? And he keeps pressing and pressing, okay? Again, looking for more details, okay?

Then there's a phone call. He tries calling. He says,
"Hey, sorry I missed your call." That tells you how anxious
he is, that he went ahead and tried to call the GE employee
spontaneously because he hadn't quite gotten any commitment as
to where the guy was going. That tells you how much he's
pressing him.

Then the GE employee sends back a clarification for his questions. This is responsive to Xu's own questions about the directory. But then they do set up a call. And the phone call is pretty revealing. A lot of it gets into the logistics. A lot of it is talk about his personal life and, as Mr. Olson explained, this is part of what a case officer tries to develop in terms of understanding a target and knowing their whole life.

But what's really interesting is when the topic of the directory comes up. And by the way, it is Xu that brings it up. They're talking about now maybe we can meet in Europe. And he says, "By the way, the document list that you sent last time is pretty good stuff. I wonder if it's convenient for

you to bring that stuff." He's telling him to bring the computer to Europe. Wants to see if he can bring it along, all right? Yet another tasking.

He previously asked for stuff related to the system code. Then he sends the domestic requirements, wants those answers. Then he says, "Hey, can you print a directory?" He gets a directory and says, "Hey, bring it. Can you bring the computer?" It's tasking after tasking, where he is initiating the action.

He's asking, demanding, trying to get this information, inside information. Somebody he knows. It's a composite expert inside GE that he thinks is on the outs with the company. He wants to get this stuff. He wants the crown jewels, the trade secrets. He asks him to bring the computer with him. Again, nobody else brought this up. This was Xu bringing this up.

They continue on in the conversation, and he talks about, "Hey, can you export it out?" Not just bring the computer.

Can you actually export this stuff or download it.

And as you see in the instructions, the jury instructions, about different ways in which you can commit these trade secret crimes. It lists all those different verbs, you know: copy, photocopy, sketch, draw, download, things like that. Copy, duplicate, this exploiting the stuff, it's right in line with those instructions, okay?

He asks him, "Can you export the information out of your GE computer," all right, because he wants to get it in a portable hard drive.

They continue on. And this is an interesting thing that talks about the insight of an MSS officer who is trying to develop a long-term relationship. He says, "We don't have to rush because if we're going to be doing business together, this won't be the last time," right? Notice that phrase "doing business together." This is a transaction. This is purely transactional. Quid pro quo, all right? He is trying to get as sensitive information he can from somebody he can exploit inside the company. As Mr. Olson explained, just like a spy would. That's what they do.

So as we get into this, here's some more in the phone call. They talk about how, hey, some other things we can just talk about in person, all right. They're not going to talk about everything. We're going to wait until they get there.

So as we move on, they have some chats. They're getting ready to meet. At this point, they talk about it, and the GE employee mentions — through Agent Hull, they send a statement saying, "Hey, I don't know if you're going to be able to read this when you get to Europe," in terms of downloading it from my computer.

And he clarifies, "Hey, does this mean I will not be able to view these documents after I bring them back?" So if there

is any doubt, he's alleviated that right there. His plan was to get the documents and take them back to China, okay? He's very clear. "Does this mean I won't be able to view these once I bring them back?" All right.

And then later on he says, in the next part of it, "Is it possible to dump to a portable hard drive or a USB drive from the work computer in advance?" Okay. Again, he repeats the tasking. Let's dump it to a hard drive in advance so that it's an easy handoff.

One more here. As if the others weren't enough to convince you, one more here. A few days later, he does it again. This is now several times he has asked him to download the information, and he throws this out, "Anything else will do." I've got you working on the cake, can you throw in any icing, because I'll take anything you can download.

Again, anything design related. He knows he's talking to a composite expert within GE. It's a key target. He's trying -- and he thinks the person is on the way out, and he's trying to get as deep and as good a information as he can get, and as much as he can get.

By the way, going back to that slide, notice the word "download." Again, that's one of the words in the instruction. The word download, that's one of the ways you can commit these crimes.

So, again, they fight over the location. At one point,

he suggests -- you heard the conversation from the translator, who talked about how they had these various phone calls, and they talked about fighting over where to meet. At one point, the defendant suggested we can meet at a train station at the border. That's how desperate he was for the handoff. But eventually, he relents and agrees to meet, okay? They set up the name of the coffee shop, and they're there.

Now, we'll get to talking about the meeting in Brussels here as I wrap this up, but I do want to note, look, with respect to these attempt crimes, well, the conspiracy crimes and the attempt crimes which cover the GE stuff, he's already committed them. You know, he's already taken numerous substantial steps toward this.

He's already asked for the trade secrets multiple times.

He's tasked this person over and over again trying to get him
to dump this computer. Okay. It's done.

So let what happened in Belgium just further confirm for you, further resolve all doubt that that's exactly what was happening here and that that's what he intended.

He had already taken many substantial steps and committed these crimes before he had even stepped foot in Brussels.

A line of person in his work, he knows he's committing the crimes. He knows he's taking a risk by going to Europe, okay? Most of what he's done that we showed you, he's doing inside China where he has protection, all right?

For him to leave and go to Europe is a big risk. He's going to have to lie to the French folks to get his visa, which he does, and he's going to have to go to Europe and take that risk, and he knows that that's what he's doing.

But that tells you something. That tells you how valuable this information was and that he thought he had the mother lode. He thought he was going to come back a hero to the MSS, maybe get Zha Rong off his back. That's what he thought. And that shows you, by the fact that he was so desperate to set up these meetings and to take the risk and come to Europe and to come to Belgium.

So look how he came. He brought his cash, and he brought the devices to download everything. Remember there was a one terabyte hard drive that was found. There were several SD cards that you could download information on to, large devices that -- large storage devices that were pretty much empty. They were ready for copying. He was anxious to get this jackpot. So he brings the cash.

He brought the multiple phones, which we already talked about, including the 5s. Mr. Xu Heng also brought two phones. He brought these devices. On there, they used the codes. He even knows what he does is risky, sends the message to his wife about if something happens.

Now, there were two particular photos that we pointed out to you that were on the phones. One in particular was this

list of questions related to the fan blade technology. And what this showed you was, you know, his notes on some of the things he wanted to discuss and follow up on the information.

The other list, as Mr. Olson explained, this is very symbolic of the type of list that typical CIA officers and intelligence officers use when they are trying to profile an asset.

These were the two lists of questions that he had on the phone when he showed up in Belgium, along with the cash and along with the storage devices.

And then he also had this. You heard the testimony that on the phone, one of the phones, they had downloaded over 200 pictures of the GE employee from the GE employee's WeChat account. They had been WeChatting, so he would have had access to it as a friend.

And there was a lot of testimony about how that might have been used, what that might have meant. What's uncontroverted is that he did, in fact, download those 200 pictures, put them on a phone and brought them to a meeting. May mean a lot of things. First of all, it's just creepy.

What it's not, it is not normal. This is not the normal behavior of somebody engaging in legitimate activity. This is somebody who knows and engages pretty regularly in criminal activity, and this is the type of information you bring for

leverage, for intimidation, maybe simply background information, but it's not normal.

This is not somebody seeking public information. This is not somebody seeking something innocently. This is an operation, an intelligence operation. And every single piece of evidence leads you to that conclusion. That is exactly why he brought this stuff.

It was an operation, and these were two MSS spies showing up in Brussels to complete the job. They brought everything they needed to get the laptop. They brought the cash. They brought the pictures. They brought further questions, because they knew who -- he knows who he is, and he knows what crimes he's committing.

One last point of emphasis that -- and then afterwards, they wipe the phone. Mr. Xu Heng is released from jail, and the next day we showed you the iCloud records showing one of the phones was wiped, and that goes back to an iCloud account that Mr. Xu Heng had used.

So at least for his associate who got released, he immediately turns around and tries to -- and actually does destroy evidence.

I want to, first of all, emphasize the GE portion of it that we just walked through. So it began and ended with what happened there. That's applicable to the conspiracies in Counts 1 and 2. It's also applicable -- it is the main part,

it is the part that is in Counts 3 and 4, which are the attempts, all right? And we believe that the evidence in there supports all of those.

I appreciate your patience. I want to leave you with one last thought.

So here in America, we are -- we use the phrase "we're a nation of laws." And the laws in this case, trade secret laws, espionage laws, are set up for one fundamental principle.

You can develop technology with your own innovation, your own hard work. You can buy it. But you can't steal it.

That's what the law is for, to tell you you can't steal it.

We learned this when we were kids. You don't steal.

And what you saw in the evidence in this case was over and over and over again how Mr. Xu, the MSS, and his other colleagues in these China entities had been engaging in a large, concerted effort to engage in this kind of theft of trade secrets from aviation companies in the U.S. and in companies around the world.

And the compelling evidence that you heard in this case came from his own words, came from his own mouth; his recordings, his chats, et cetera. It shows far beyond any kind of reasonable doubt who he is and what he does.

He is Xu Yanjun. He is a spy. His job is to steal aviation technology and trade secrets. He does it by luring

employees over to China and exploiting them, stealing from them, doing whatever he can, compromising them.

He engaged in the Safran hacking and helped plant malware on an aviation employee, and he extensively went after a GE composite engineer and tried to get the entire GE laptop, including all its trade secrets that were on it.

That's who he is. That's what he's done. And he's guilty. He's guilty of all four crimes.

And on behalf of the United States, we ask that you return a verdict of guilty. Guilty on all crimes.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Mangan.

The government has presented the first portion of its closing argument. It's 1:00. We're going to break for an hour and 15 minutes so you can have lunch upstairs.

Take the break. No discussion among yourselves yet.

We're not quite there. Continue to keep an open mind. We still got a closing argument to hear. No independent research. No discussion with anybody.

Enjoy your break. Enjoy your lunch. Out of respect for you, we'll rise as you leave for an hour and 15 minutes.

(Jury out at 1:05 p.m.)

THE COURT: The jury's left the courtroom. The door is closing. We're about to break for an hour and 15 minutes for lunch.

```
Is there anything that requires my attention before we
 1
 2
      recess from the government?
               MR. MANGAN: No, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: Defense?
 4
 5
               MR. KOHNEN: No. Thank you, Judge.
               THE COURT: All right. See you at 2:15.
 6
 7
           (Lunch recess.)
 8
               THE COURT: We're back in the open courtroom, on the
 9
      record. The government's team is here, defense team is here,
10
      including the defendant and two interpreters.
11
           Are we ready to get the jury from the government's
12
      perspective?
13
               MR. MANGAN: Yes, Your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: Are we ready from the defendant's
15
      perspective?
               MR. KOHNEN: Yes, Your Honor.
16
17
               THE COURT: Let's call for the jury, please.
18
           (Jury in at 2:21 p.m.)
19
               THE COURT: You may all be seated. Thank you.
20
           Members of the jury, all of them have returned to the
21
      courtroom after the lunch break. Welcome back. Thank you for
22
      your close attention.
23
           We'll now proceed to hear closing argument on behalf of
24
      the defense.
25
               MR. KOHNEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: You're welcome.

MR. KOHNEN: May it please the Court, counsel, my esteemed colleagues, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. Good afternoon.

Like Mr. Mangan, I, too, want to thank you for your service on behalf of Mr. Xu and on behalf of my colleagues. We couldn't do it without you, and we really appreciate your attention.

What I'd like to do, as soon as I get this frog out of my throat, is ask you to remember a couple of very important principles as I go through my presentation this afternoon.

I want you to remember Judge Black's instructions. I want you to remember his instruction about the burden of proof, and I want you to remember especially about the presumption of innocence.

With respect to the burden of proof, remember proof must be beyond a reasonable doubt in order to convict. I don't want you to ever let that leave your peripheral vision during my presentation, if you would, please.

Almost as a matter of housekeeping, what I'd like to do -- it will be a little bit redundant, but what I'd like to do is reply to a couple of the points that Mr. Mangan made during his closing argument before I begin what really amount to my prepared remarks.

As I said, it's going to be a little bit redundant, but

that way I won't miss anything, and I hope I'll get the important stuff to you.

The first thing that Mr. -- or at least one of the first things that Mr. Mangan talked about was this vast conspiracy, a mountain of evidence. And he talked about -- and he was talking about the conspiracies that allegedly began earlier, a conspiracy that involves the People's Republic of China as an unindicted coconspirator.

Ladies and gentlemen, that's 1.4 million people. So rather than consider the intent of 1.4 plus million people or their representative or representatives, let's do what we came here to do. Let's focus on one person, my client, Mr. Xu.

This is a man and the only person whose guilt or innocence you are here to decide about. You want to decide primarily about his intent and his knowledge. His intent, his knowledge. Not Chen Feng's, not Zha Rong's, not Tian's. His.

Another thing I want to tell you is, Mr. Mangan's remarks to the contrary notwithstanding, this case is very much about GE Aviation.

All of the other companies that Mr. Mangan named and who might be named in these overt acts are tangential. They're tangential. They bring the government's conspiracy back to 2013, to be sure, and that's by design. But the focus of this investigation began, you'll recall, with General Electric Aviation, and I submit that throughout has been the

primary focus.

A couple of -- I'm going to jump around a bit. I hope you'll forgive me. But one of the things I also found puzzling, a bit troubling, is this expressed belief that Mr. -- Mr. Mangan's remark that Mr. Xu thought that the material that he was storing in a cloud that ended up on a server in California was never going to see the light of day.

How does a man as sophisticated as Mr. Olson claims, as sneaky as Mr. Mangan and Ms. Glatfelter claim, miss that?

Ladies and gentlemen, I have an iPhone. I submit, I suspect that probably at this time more than half of you have iPhones, or at least half. We allow our information to be stored in the cloud and, ultimately, on an Apple server because we've got nothing to hide, right?

Another thing that puzzles me -- and Mr. Mangan tried to explain it away, but how does a man who is a superspy travel under his own identity? How does a man who is taking a sneaky, nefarious, undercover trip to the Paris Air Show, of all people -- of all places, travel under his own identity?

If this was such an important project, such a secret project, such a stealthy project, don't you think he would have been able to obtain a counterfeit or even a genuine Chinese passport in a second name? Folks, these things don't make sense. It's because they're cobbling things together and trying to make them fit.

Now, different identities, I think -- I get the sense that we may all be on the same page. I mentioned in my opening, I thought it was kind of cute, when you log on to a company's website and you see that attractive young person in the bottom right that says "Hi, I'm Jane. How can I help you today?" we know that's not Jane, right?

But the fact of the matter is -- and part of what

Mr. Mangan said is correct. If Mr. Xu comes up to somebody

and says, "Hi, Yanjun Xu from the Ministry of State Security,"

you're going to go "whoa," right?

If Special Agent Hull went to Lowe's and introduced himself to the person at the checkout as FBI Special Agent Hull, you go "whoa." I'm a lawyer. I don't want people to know I'm a lawyer sometimes when I'm dealing because they're afraid I'm going to sue them. And when I was a federal prosecutor, which I was for 16 years, I didn't advertise that either.

So the aliases, I think we can understand why Mr. Xu would hide his MSS affiliation. But one of the things I also want to be careful about is this accusation that we ever denied that Mr. Xu was using the alias Qu Hui. That's my pronunciation.

Now, what I meant when I mentioned that in my opening statement is something that we'll get to in a little more detail. You're going to conclude -- you've already concluded

that you can't tell who they're really communicating with on the other end. You don't know whether it's Mr. Qu Hui, or whether it's Mr. Chen Feng, or if it's Mr. Xu, or if it's someone else, right?

I think we've got to come to accept that, folks, because nobody knew for months that Mr. Zhang was actually Special Agent Hull, right? I mean, it's a two-way street.

Mr. Mangan mentioned Linda Li. I'm not abundantly familiar with Linda Li, and neither are you because we didn't hear her testimony.

And I submit to you that maybe it would have been helpful to hear her testimony. I think it certainly would have been more helpful than the testimony we got from Arthur Gao and Sun Li, and even to some extent David Zheng because they didn't take us anywhere. They not only didn't take us to a point beyond a reasonable doubt, they didn't take us to any point of clarity.

And this claim that Mr. Xu is some kind of evil recruiter. He's a recruiter. Nobody's ever hidden from that. He's affiliated and works for MSS. Nobody's ever hidden from that.

And while we're at it, you know, that recording of the meeting he had after Arthur Gao's interview, when he talked about security is tight, Mr. Mangan said that he refused, you'll recall, to accept the security features that the

company's -- or the security requirements that aviation companies put on their employees. That's wrong.

Go back and look at that transcript, if you'd like. He said security is tight, and he moved on. The fact of the matter is, it reads to me and it will to you like he was accepting that fact and they were going to do different things; and, you know, that's precisely what started, at least, to happen with David Zheng. And we'll get to that shortly.

THE COURT: Can you keep your voice up?

MR. KOHNEN: I'm sorry. Yes.

Ladies and gentlemen, the other thing that I want to confront right up front is this hacking of Safran and the confusing confusion that the government has created between a hacking event of the mother company in France and the malware that was planted on the computer of the French Safran computer -- Safran engineer, Hascoet. We'll get to that in a minute, but I'd like you to please keep an open mind about that because it's not as it seems.

These references to the Eighth Division and the applied techniques are all very cryptic and kind of ill-defined here.

And Mr. Mangan said, and I think I'm quoting him, "It's pretty clear what's going on here. A major component of the first conspiracy and first attempt counts, and it's pretty clear what's going on here." That does not sound like beyond

a reasonable doubt to me.

I'm not going to get into a battle of words about whether the FBI broke Zheng, David Zheng, or didn't break David Zheng. You decide for yourself. Two FBI agents hot-boxed him, interviewed him alone, unannounced, for seven hours. Do you think that was a pleasant experience? Do you think they treated him well? Oh, I'm sure they treated him like a king after he joined Team USA, as they say, right? But that's when they wanted something from him. I guess they got it on the stand here.

By the way, the layoffs thing. Mr. Mangan tried to make an excuse there for Agent Hull's lie when he had taken over as David Zheng, and he sent an email purportedly to Mr. Xu saying he was worried about layoffs, and Mr. Mangan said, "Well, there were layoffs. It was in the paper and stuff."

Ladies and gentlemen, David Zheng had already been fired, or at least on leave without pay. A layoff from GE was probably the least of his concerns at that point.

Another thing, and I'm going to tell you this just in case I forget. I thought that the words that -- the statement that Mr. Mangan attributed to Nick Kray, the GE engineer, were pretty telling, and they were words that I found and are interesting.

Kray talks about what I think Mr. Mangan called a task list, whatever it was, that list of questions that were on

Mr. -- well, we think Mr. Xu's phone when he came to Belgium.

And Kray's testimony was, "Well, the information behind

this -- those are good questions, but the information behind

this, that would be our key tech information." I think "the

key technical information" was the way he referred to it.

How far behind? He didn't mean -- I didn't take it.

You're the judge. He didn't mean explicit answers to those questions. He meant, and I think he said, Well, if somebody knew what they were asking, and there was a conversation, and they got layers behind these questions, then yeah, our key information would be susceptible.

And, ladies and gentlemen, I don't fault anybody for protecting that key information, but I want to make sure that you all get the clear story so that you can make a fair and objective assessment.

So let's talk about a couple of other things that this case is not about. The government's efforts to the contrary notwithstanding, this case is not about whether Mr. Xu was employed by MSS. It's not about whether he was a spy, if you want to call him a spy, whatever that means. And neither of those statuses make him guilty in this case. Let's agree absolutely on that.

And, again, these sort of frightening allusions -- with an "a" -- to military and classified information, folks, they're designed to scare you. GE doesn't make a polymetric

[sic] fan blade for military aircraft.

THE COURT: Please keep your voice up.

MR. KOHNEN: I'm sorry. It's not about EARS violations, it's not about iPhone violations. What this case is about is the ultimate and only question for your consideration, and that is has the government presented enough evidence, a good enough evidence to convince you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that Mr. Xu tried to obtain trade secrets. The government has not presented sufficient information for that.

Judge Black has instructed you on the illegal transfer of science and technology, and it's a narrow definition. Please read it and heed it because the evidence shows that Mr. Xu was engaged in the legal collection of aircraft technology.

This case is about a man who was caught up in a controversy between the U.S. and China over China's advancing competency and abilities technologically. And this case is about, I'm sorry to say, General Electric and the FBI trying to send a message to China and to slow China's progress in developing composite technology, which we all now know will eat away at General Electric's market.

Believe what you will about the government's evidence in this case, ladies and gentlemen, but there's no way that you can conclude, beyond a reasonable doubt, that our client has intended to steal trade secret information as Judge Black has

defined it.

There's one place, as I mentioned earlier, where the government's evidence falls woefully short. I'd like you to think about the fact witnesses I mentioned: Arthur Gao, Sun Li, David Zheng. What happened there? Nothing.

There were no requests for secret information. There was no "ask" there. There was no "there" there. These were the government's witnesses, and they were honest.

So let's talk a little bit about how the government failed, and let's talk about Arthur Gao, a star witness. Poor Arthur Gao. I mean, honestly, I repeat it, it's hard to understand why the government even called him as a witness because the bottom line to his testimony is what we have been saying all along.

Sure, Mr. Xu was trying to -- was trying to cultivate experts from abroad. Sure, he was trying to get them to share their expertise. Sure, he paid them and wined them and dined them, and that's -- what does that prove exactly?

Here's why Arthur Gao is the prime example. The MSS literally had decades to get to Gao and to try to ask him for trade secrets. That's what they wanted. He lectured there beginning in 1997. By my math, that's 24 years ago. I think Mr. Mangan talked about planting the seeds. Well, for crying out loud, if you planted the seeds 24 years ago, don't you have a garden by now? Nothing.

He met with Zha Rong, this person Zha Rong at NUAA.

Nothing. He went to China in 2016. Nothing. They gave him money. They paid for his flights, but no asks. They didn't even — he wouldn't even say that they said something like, "C'mon, you know, make a few copies of your files for us" or something. Nothing like that.

What did they ask for from him? "Anything will do." Do you remember him saying that over and over in response to the questions? "Anything will do. Art, just send us whatever you can." That's the way it worked. That's what they were looking for.

Gao goes to China in 2017. What's he ask? Four super general presentation topics on engineering was his test---engineering presentation topics was his answer. He agrees they had nothing to do with secret proprietary information.

In 2018, he talks about returning to China. You'll remember Mujin. I think there was a certain fondness there. He WeChats with her. She sends him some specific engineering questions.

Once again, Mr. Gao describes them only as general engineering questions. He was asked, "Anything from Honeywell?" Nope. "Anything about product or material that Honeywell was working on that wants you to keep secret?" Nope.

The later technology that Gao shared, it turned out, at

the very end of his testimony, I think you'll remember, was stuff that he had worked on 20 years ago.

Go back to the judge's definition of a trade secret. Something a company wants to keep secret because it provides them with a competitive advantage and makes them money. Do any of the questions that you recall or answers that Mr. Gao gave reflect trade secrets as the judge has defined them? They do not.

Meanwhile, poor Mr. Gao has to enter a guilty plea to -what did he enter a guilty plea? Something completely
unrelated to this because, as he admitted, he made a mistake
and he said some stuff, unsolicited, to Mujin. That's how
they got him here. But he helped our case and not the
government's case.

So then we heard, and I think we have -- might have this in the wrong order, but from this gentleman named Sun Li, who is the government's star witness number two. He's the former Boeing IT supervisor.

Mr. Mangan had a pretty fanciful theory about why they reached out to Mr. Sun Li. I don't know if it's partially true or not, but you remember Mr. Li 's testimony. And if you're like me, you'll remember sitting here going, why did the government bring this guy all the way from Washington to testify about what amounts to nothing? There was no evidence about trade secret. There was no pitch that he could help

them with IT stuff. And despite -- this is important because it shows where the government comes from.

Despite repeated questions trying to get him to say that he was communicating with Mr. Xu and others because he was afraid for his father's safety, do you remember those questions? And you remember each time, Mr. Li said no. No. He's not afraid. He wasn't threatened. This is the stuff of spy novels, ladies and gentlemen. It's not real life.

Then we have star witness number three, Mr. David Zheng, the most important of the government's cooperators, as they call them. Mr. Zheng was a large part of the government's case because almost all this case, as I said before, really gets back to GE, and he was the GE engineer.

Let's talk about, very quickly, because we've gone over these WeChats, et cetera, pretty much, but let's talk pretty quickly about what we learned at least about David Zheng and his interactions with Qu Hui, Chen Feng, Mr. Xu, or whoever, before Special Agent Hull took over his identity.

He was invited to NUAA in March of 2017. He was clear in his communications that he could not and would not discuss or reveal trade secrets. That was a point that he made on several occasions, and he was very clear about it.

It was understood from that point forward that only Mr. Zheng was in a position to identify what was trade secret protected information at GE and what was not.

And that makes perfect sense, doesn't it, folks, because if you know what a trade secret is, then it's not really a secret, right, especially when it comes to the really exotic and accomplished technology that Mr. Mangan described with respect to GE.

Here's a bit of irony for you too. Mr. Zheng honored that commitment to GE. He did not reveal trade secret information, and they fired him anyway.

So on March of 2017, the first email from Chen Feng goes out, and he says clearly -- and this goes out to Mr. Zheng, "There is no restriction on the format of the exchange."

Mr. Zheng replies back and asks about the format again. Chen Feng responds, "Our formats of exchange are diversified. They can be adjusted according to your availability." He then follows up a couple of weeks later asking about Mr. Zheng -- and this is very important. He says, "Can you send me your preliminary thinking regarding the exchange you will be doing." This isn't an ask. This isn't a directive suggestion. This is "it's up to you, bud," right?

Zheng responds, "I don't know about the format --" he's stuck on the format. He says, "Please provide some general information." So he's basically asking Feng, Chen Feng, help me out. What do you want?

Chen Feng replies, "Regarding the content of the exchanges, the university would like to have you propose two

or three of your specialized research topics."

Chen Feng then replies, almost the same day, and says, "By the way, there's no restrictions on the format." Time goes by. Finally, Chen Feng sends Mr. Zheng an email and says — makes some suggestive topics, and he says, "But you can also propose contents that you would like to do in this exchange in which you have expertise."

Zheng likes Chen Feng's topics, but he gives the warning we've read over and over again, "I'm required to sign a technical agreement with the company that I work for here. Therefore, a lot of the work that I have conducted at the company could not be shared," blah, blah, blah. And how does Chen Feng respond? Basically, "Fine. No problem. We respect that." You remember that, right?

So what happens now? That was May 21st of 2017. What happens now is Mr. Zheng is working hard on his presentation, which is going to happen the first or second day of April -- of June, pardon me.

Unbeknownst to him, Mr. Ritter and the folks at GE

Aviation are working hard trying to determine whether or not

Zheng gave anything up in his PowerPoint presentation, and
they find out that he didn't.

The important thing is during this time, which is, I think, by my math -- well, anyway, it was some time, so -- let me back up for a minute.

So at this point, we're in May of 2017. We've got no evidence of any intent, any ask, any intent to steal trade secrets, and neither Chen Feng, Qu Hui, Xu, or anybody followed up with David Zheng for five months. Five months.

David Zheng gets his non-prosecution agreement deal.

GE figures out that Zheng didn't give up any trade secrets,

and Special Agent Hull has to decide on what he calls an

operational pivot, which is jargon for, uh-oh, we better find

a new target, and they focus on Mr. Xu.

Also during that time, GE got Zheng's computer. They analyzed it. They turned over the results to the FBI. Of course, there was the interview of Mr. Zheng.

By the way, I want to remind you of the circumstances of that interview, okay? It was done at GE. He was called in to the big conference room. That interview was audiotaped and videoed.

The agents weren't there when Mr. Ritter from GE Aviation and his colleague met with Mr. Zheng. Instead, they were in a different room listening to the audio and perhaps watching the video, right?

Seven hours that interview lasted. He had no phone, no car; eventually, some food. And he had to call his wife, but he couldn't tell her why -- he had to speak in English. He had to speak on the speakerphone. He couldn't tell her why he was calling her or what was going on. Turns out she knew

about the search, and he was questioned about that as well.

Do you think that that's treating a person well?

So then Special Agent Hull assumes Zheng's identity. He makes up a fib to Qu Hui and says he wants to come to China to give another exchange. He refuses to accept that these guys won't specify the requirements for a presentation.

So what he does is he offers full access to General Electric materials. He sends increasingly specific and enticing emails, at one point sending even the Exhibit Number 68 that Mr. Mangan showed you which, to the uneducated, looks like the design for the Gen GE9X engine, which is the latest and greatest, as we've all heard. But neither Mr. Xu, or Qu Hui, or whoever, takes the bait.

But I think it's important to stop here and think about that because, by all accounts, right now on this day, which is February 3rd of 2018, Agent Hull, without being asked, has now shared what is represented to be GE proprietary and trade secret information.

That, of course, prompts questions coming back from Mr. Xu, somewhat technical questions, questions that prompt Mr. Hull, Agent Hull as David Zheng, to respond. And he says, "I'm familiar with most of the topics you mentioned --" the questions prompted by Exhibit 68, right?

And he says, "Regarding the answers to these questions, some topics are more sensitive than others because the

involvement of GE intellectual property and commercial secrets, such as the previous email I sent to you --"

Exhibit 68, right? -- "regarding the topics mentioned in the email attachment you sent," blah, blah, blah. In other words, uh-oh, this is trade secret. I can't divulge. I can't answer these questions.

It's a bit of a head fake, right?

The important thing that I want to stress is, you know, Mr. Mangan says that my client, Mr. Xu, is charging ahead, charging ahead. Whoa. Who's charging ahead?

Then we get around to it's still not clear who actually suggested or mentioned for the first time this computer directory, but I want to be very clear that the computer directory is just that, the directory, and we're not talking at this point yet about the contents that the titles of the items in the directory are supposed to represent, right? You guys remember all that.

And you remember that Special Agent Hull testified that Mr. Ritter made up the directory. Mr. Ritter denied that, but one thing we know is it wasn't Mr. Zheng's original directory. We don't know, or at least we didn't hear what happened to that.

So the thing reaches a bit of a standstill. And what happens? Well, the FBI decides that we got to lure our man to Belgium, and we got to go get our man, right?

So they do whatever paperwork needs to be done here in this courthouse, and they do whatever paperwork needs to be done in the Kingdom of Belgium.

Mr. Hull, as David Zheng, lies about a trip to France.

He lies about being able to get away for the weekend. He lies about logistics and travels so that he can lure my client to Belgium, which, by the way, is a friendly extradition state, and they arrest him.

Now, folks, in criminal cases, motive is always important. The defendant's motive, but other motives as well. The investigator's motives.

I'll call your attention to the jury instruction that

Judge Black gave you about testimony by law enforcement

personnel, right? At a minimum, to put it mildly, you're to

look into that testimony a little more deeply, a little more

carefully.

What we have here is a tight collaboration between General Electric and the FBI. Now, Mr. Ritter, of course, denied that. He's the cyber security vice president who appears to have suffered amnesia from a head injury between his direct testimony and his cross-examination, if you know what I mean.

His memory was sharp as a tack for Ms. Glatfelter. When I got up here to cross-examine him, he could hardly remember his name, couldn't remember 11 meetings or contacts --

11 documented meetings or contacts in a 7-month time with Special Agent Hull and others.

What does that tell you?

He denied fabricating the Zheng made-up computer, despite the fact that Special Agent Hull told us that he's the one that put it together.

You know, the people we did not hear from General Electric are the engineers who spent days poring over Mr. Zheng's PowerPoint presentation to honestly conclude that trade secret information had not been revealed.

You know, the witness, James Mulvenon -- I'm going to pronounce it the best I can -- helps us with this. You know, he talked about the incentives that companies like GE have to keep China from advancing so they stay on top of that market.

He talked about continuing to sell products, announced aircraft engines in China. He talked about continuing to manufacture cheaply. And here we see General Electric continuing to exploit China. Exploit and -- maybe that's not the right word -- exist there, but in a very precarious state.

First of all, they've got joint ventures with AVIC and others in China, right? Look at the slide there. We added a little something to Mr. Mulvenon's slide.

They want cheap, educated labor. They want to get into China's market. They want to take advantage of China's lax environmental laws, but they don't want to share the

technology. And that's where the tenuous rub is, right? That's good.

So let's talk about some of the government's misdirections. In their opening statement, at least, they led you to believe that his job at MSS was to engage professionals and to steal aviation -- knowingly and intentionally steal aviation technology secrets. That hasn't worked out.

What this is, really, is nothing more than guilt by association. And if you're part of MSS, this mysterious scary organization that's filled with spies, you must be an evil spy that steals aviation trade secrets and goes beyond your job responsibilities.

The government, ladies and gentlemen, is playing on your patriotism. They're playing to your fears. They're hoping that you'll punish Mr. Xu and overlook their burden of proof, but you have to be objective because you swore an oath to do that.

You know, thinking back on Mr. Mulvenon's testimony for a minute, his testimony confirms that open source collection about science and technology and through other legal means is part -- including personal and professional exchanges is part of MSS's mission.

Now, not a single other government witness had any knowledge regarding at least the Sixth Bureau of MSS, which is where Mr. Xu allegedly worked. But it didn't surprise

Mr. Mulvenon if the Sixth Bureau engaged in open source collection analysis.

Also, Mr. Mulvenon testified that the MSS focuses -- oh, I'm sorry, functions a lot like the CIA and the FBI, in that they have both international responsibilities and domestic security responsibilities. And that's very important, especially when it comes to some of these wild-eyed allegations about hacking and computer intrusions because, you see, the Safran and these Eighth apply techniques references, if they're references to computer intrusions at all, are obviously instances where Mr. Xu and the MSS are handling matters of state security, internal state security. It's part of their name, the Ministry of State Security.

The only evidence that we've seen, testimony anyway that we've heard, is from Mr. Hascoet, the engineer from Safran, who, you'll recall, works for a Chinese subsidiary in China, comes and goes between France and China, okay?

Now, China is a surveillance state. Mr. Mulvenon agreed with that. I think that, to the extent he was able,
Mr. Olson did. Special Agent Adams agreed that these kind of computer intrusions or hacks could be used to track individuals and maintain state security.

We have not seen any evidence that trade secrets were targeted, and we haven't received any information that such things were exported or obtained through these computer

intrusions, despite that promise being made during the government's opening statement.

Quickly I want to go over the testimony of Special Agent Adam James because it was pretty useful and it's right on point here, right?

He conducted the forensic analysis of Mr. Hascoet's computer, the Safran engineer. He said he was unable to tell whether any information was targeted. Didn't look like any information was extracted, even though MSS had access to this fellow's computer-ness, I guess, for a month, right.

He acknowledged also, as I said before, that malware could be used to surveil and monitor someone who travels to and from work in China.

Also, remember Mr. Hascoet's job did not include anything close to designing aircraft engine stuff. He was supervising the manufacturing process, and he talked about when parts come in, I think from Taiwan, for assembly, he makes sure that everything's running well.

Mr. Zheng was asked repeatedly about his computer.

Wasn't it hacked? This was something that Mr. Mangan was going to get to in a minute, the individual hacks, and I don't remember whether he did or didn't, but the government would not let it go. They asked him like three times was your computer in exactly the same place, you know, did it not work or whatever. There was no hack of David Zheng's computer,

okay?

Ditto for Arthur Gao. Arthur Gao was asked that question repeatedly also, and all he could say was I never even brought my company computer to China when I came. So there's just Mr. Hascoet, and his testimony doesn't add anything. Bottom line, big, fat red herring. Distraction.

Speaking of distractions, I talked about this earlier.

We are not talking about export administration regulated

material. We're not talking about military material. We're

not talking about classified material. Don't get distracted

there. Don't get thrown off your game.

The government threw some references out, they even put a witness on, I'm trying to remember how to pronounce his name, Mr. Ramakdawala, and that's -- I'll help you with that spelling. And that was all about military technology and EAR stuff, and licensing requirements and stuff. I don't know where we were getting with that.

That was a waste of time, until we got to James Olson.

Mr. Olson, you'll remember, is a long retired spy, and the government called him, I guess, to demonstrate that everyday occurrences in our life are spycraft.

I don't know if you guys remember Jeff Foxworthy. Jeff Foxworthy used to say "you might be a redneck if you got your grandmother's old refrigerator in your front yard," or something like that. So we thought -- I thought immediately

of Mr. Olson, the "you might be a spy if you have more than one social media account," because he said that's indicative of spycraft. Or if you have more than one email account, ditto. Or if you have a nickname. Or if you contacted someone through LinkedIn.

In the beginning of his testimony, he said that signals spycraft. Or you have two cell phones. You shared a tea or had a meal with someone, downloaded data on to a disk. Stop there because I love that one. It kind of reveals his age, folks, right? When was the last time anybody downloaded data on a disk? And also when Mr. -- when he got out of the -- out from undercover, it was 1997. That may be all we had back then. And finally, if you attended a job-related conference.

These are normal, everyday things. I mean, look, if you're willing to go that far, then you can create a little diagram that is designed to convince people that anything's true.

Again, Mr. Olson was on the stand, and he deflected your attention. He has no knowledge of the Ministry of State Security, no knowledge of the JSSD, Jiangsu State Security Department. Never worked in China. Hasn't worked in intelligence in over 20 years. Believes he knows what was in the heads of Mr. Xu. You remember that special instruction about -- special instruction about him.

It appears that the evidence that he was given -- that

whatever he was given to prep, either he didn't read it or it was insufficient because he says he read the emails. But if he did, he didn't understand them because, as we all now know, Mr. Zheng, as of November of 2017, was actually Mr. Hull, who I think you'll agree, when you go back and look at those emails if you need to, became the pursuer.

He didn't know anything about MSS's structures. He didn't know what the Sixth Bureau did. He didn't know the functions of MSS. He didn't know that they had a domestic security function. He was unaware it collected open source information. He had only a very basic understanding of MSS and his mission. Frankly, his recruitment cycle that Mr. Mangan showed you briefly is unsupported by the evidence in this case.

As I said before, LinkedIn is a legitimate social media platform that's used by millions of people.

Dr. Zheng, you'll recall, testified that tea, lunch, and dinner with Mr. Xu as his host is expected and customary in China. If you invite someone to China as your guest, you are responsible for their food and lodging. It's not spycraft. It's culture. It's not spycraft. It's decency.

Mr. Zheng testified -- remember Mr. Olson made a big deal about the money. Mr. Zheng testified that the money paid him for travel, for his lecture and his travel, was appropriate.

And he said -- and this is important -- that it's now common

for people to be paid in U.S. dollars. Olson didn't know these things. Olson's testimony is a wash. Olson's testimony is unreliable.

Mulvenon, on the other hand, was helpful. Mr. Mulvenon laid out for us the counterintelligence functions of the MSS. He talked about extensive surveillance in China. He talked about how hacking may also be or is also a technique that's used for security. He agreed that cyber intrusions are a legitimate tool for intrusions. He, like Olson, views China as a surveillance state. China believes in total control of cyberspace within its borders.

By the way, as I mentioned before, I think Special Agent James from the cyber section at the FBI office in San Diego agrees with that too.

Open source collection and analysis, Mulvenon said, is one of the MSS's three biggest core functions. And he also testified that intelligence is simply the analysis of information to obtain value from that information and to answer questions.

This is not the sinister, dirty, sneaky, corrupt project that the government wants you to believe; but, importantly, as Mr. Mangan said in part, at least, there is no secret recipe to this absolutely fantastic technology that General Electric Aviation has developed.

As Nick Kray said, even as Mr. Ramakdawala said, this is

a building block approach, building block technique that they've used. Lots and lots of trial and error, trial and error. One step forward, two steps backwards; three steps forward, two steps backwards. That's how they developed this.

And even Kray was clear. He talked about the coupons and all the different applications. A Chinese spy was not going to go to someone from GE and get the recipe for Coca-Cola, all right? It just doesn't work that way.

And if you need to, go back and look at the evidence and -- with this thought in mind: They're interested in the process. They're interested in the stages. None of the so-called key technology that Mr. Kray talked about was asked for, right?

And, by the way, I thought his testimony was very helpful to all of us, right? I mean, he educated us all. Seemed like a good guy and a straight shooter. And I think he was particularly straight when I -- as I mentioned before, he saw the questions, remember, that were allegedly on Mr. Xu's phone which he brought to Nanjing -- or, I'm sorry, to Amsterdam, and he said, "Oh, these are good questions," right? "The information behind these questions could get closer to our key technology, and we'd be careful."

We're not here to tell you that they weren't trying to get close. I mean, they wanted to learn what they could learn.

China was looking for best practices. They were looking for the general approach so that they could advance their own project, which you heard about, on polymetric composite fan blades.

Look, they started by asking what amounts to -- for what amounts to David Zheng's universe- -- Akron University Ph.D. research. Remember that?

They weren't looking for the secret sauce, folks. They were looking for directions on how to make the secret sauce, advice.

The government has talked a fair amount about the state-owned enterprises. And, you know, particularly, in the very beginning of the case, during the opening statement, they talked about AVIC and COMAC and NUAA and JAST and all these government entities that are supposedly dirty and corrupt, et cetera.

Well, GE has a joint venture with COMAC, right? I mean, they're selling them their engines.

NUAA is very well respected. We've heard that. It's an established university with a good reputation.

JAST is a large trade association.

Mulvenon agrees that it's not uncommon for universities, particularly universities that specialize in aviation, to have relationships with associations like JAST.

So let's talk about, again, what the evidence really does

show. We're getting close to the net here, I think.

THE COURT: I'm not trying to be difficult, but keep your voice up, please.

MR. KOHNEN: I'm sorry. I apologize.

So we've heard substantial information about China's comprehensive program to collect and analyze publicly available information from overseas.

We know from Mr. Mulverson -- Mulvenon, I'll get it right one of these days -- that this is a key function of MSS.

We also heard Mulvenon testify about the importance of human intelligence and the importance it plays in collecting evidence; not in a nefarious way, but it helps with the analysis of publicly available information. It gives you up-to-date information, and it provides context. And that's what Mr. Xu was doing.

Mulvenon agreed that obtaining guidance for collection from government actors, wherever they come from, is not, in and of itself, illegal.

And what about non-public, non-trade secret information?

This was something, I think you'll recall, Mr. Mulvenon spent
a fair amount of time on. He testified that the collection of
non-trade secret information is a growing focus of China's
collection efforts. He testified that this includes
information that may not be obtained through -- that may be
obtained, excuse me, through researchers, expert exchanges,

presentations at universities, et cetera.

He testified, in essence, that the government may not like these forms of intelligence gathering, but they're not illegal. He testified that multinational companies might not like these forms of technical exchanges, but they're not illegal. He said that he believes this is an area that requires new legislation.

What he was saying there, essentially, is that the very statutes under which Mr. Xu has been charged do not apply to the work he was doing. Hard stop. That's what Mr. Mulvenon said.

The requirements that U.S. companies -- there are requirements that U.S. companies transfer technology to China, okay, and that's the pay to play that Mulvenon testified about as well.

There's nothing illegal about it. And he said that companies agree to these demands because they want access to China's cheap labor. They want China's educated labor. They want lax environmental standards. They want access to the fastest growing market in the world.

And then we have China's joint ventures, right? We've got GE, Safran, Boeing, AVIC, COMAC. They all have joint ventures, and they all can be tenuous, but there you see -- on the left side of your screen, you'll see that talent program that I mentioned to you during the opening statement, a joint

venture between GE, COMAC, and AVIAGE, which I believe is part of AVIC.

You know, China does other things as well. They have pretty much forced multinational companies to have research and development labs in country, and that's Mulvenon's testimony as well.

But despite all that, what's happened here is Mr. Xu, my client, has become a pawn, a pawn in the tense place between U.S. industries trying to exploit China and trying to get along with China, right? And, you know, just one guy. He's just one guy, right?

So if we're going to send a message to Xi Jinping, if we're going to send a message to MSS, if we're going to send a message to AVIC, to COMAC, to all these evil Communist government-run companies, let's snatch that guy.

One of the things that Mr. Mangan talked about was he accused Mr. Xu of not being normal, of not behaving. "This isn't normal behavior." You remember he repeated that three or four times. My question is, normal by whose standards?

Speaking of normal, Mr. Gao talked about how the exchanges like we were -- he testified about how the exchanges like he was setting up with Mr. Zheng were perfectly common, that he'd been to several himself.

He agreed that expertise is shared and built up over those things, and there's nothing wrong with talking about

your experience. Remember he said that your employer doesn't 1 2 own your experience. 3 (Cell phone ringing.) MR. KOHNEN: Hello? 4 5 THE COURT: That was unintentional. Seize the phone 6 and proceed. 7 MR. KOHNEN: Thank you, Judge. 8 May I have just a moment, Your Honor? 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 MR. KOHNEN: One of the things -- kind of a loose end 11 here, forgive me. One of the the things I want to come 12 back -- circle back to is, you know, folks, one of the things 13 that really is going to be an important consideration for you 14 is trying to wrap your brains around who is speaking to whom 15 when, right? And, you know, that's particularly important 16 when you think about these Gmail accounts that the government 17 has worked so hard to tie closely to Mr. Xu, right? And yet, with respect to only one -- even just one of those accounts, 18 19 it was accessed 55 times after he was arrested and after his 20 phone was put in a bag that blocked signals going out or going 21 in. 22 You know, folks, that puts this case in a whole new 23 category because Mr. Hull and Mr. Mangan and Ms. Glatfelter 24 have gone over email, after WeChat, after QQ. But, really,

when you talk about the burden of proof and reasonable doubt,

25

how do you know who's talking to who? This is a big problem for them.

I wanted to go over a couple of other things that we mentioned during our opening because I'm pretty proud of the fact that we told you like it was then.

We told you about this parallel investigation, this work together between the FBI and GE, and I think you've seen it in real life.

We told you about this setup, this frame job, and I think you've seen it now unfold.

We've heard testimony on that. We asked for the ask, right? Does everybody understand what I mean by that? Where is the ask for technological proprietary trade secret technological aviation information? We're still asking for that.

We told you there would be no evidence that trade secrets surfaced at all. There hasn't. We told you that the evidence was going to reveal that Zheng never revealed trade secrets; and, in fact, worked hard not to, and that's true. And we told you most importantly that the relationship with David Zheng was always premised on the understanding that he could not and would not share trade secrets.

Folks, Judge Black, the government, the defense here, we all told you to exercise your common sense. Please use your common sense, and that's really all you need in this case

because you can't vote to convict somebody of a crime that's based on weak circumstantial evidence, innuendo, supposition, and uncertainty.

You cannot vote to convict somebody who's told at the beginning and consistently thereafter by the likes of David Zheng that he will not share prohibited company trade secret information.

You cannot vote to convict someone who justifiably relies on his counterpart to protect the information that he or she has a duty to protect.

There's a line somewhere, folks. There's a line between information that companies would like to keep secret that isn't trade secret information as it's defined, and information that they just want to keep secret. I mean -- and trade secret information, right, it's a line. It's somewhere. Where is that line? I don't know.

The government's case never identifies where that line is under the facts that they've laid out for you, so it remains a mystery. It's impossible to find that Mr. Xu knowingly crossed that line when we don't know where the line is. It's impossible to find that he intentionally crossed the line when we don't know where the line is.

There are a lot of competing principles in this case, ladies and gentlemen, a lot of moving parts, and a lot of unanswered questions. Let me throw out a couple of including,

but not limited to, open questions.

Who was acting as Chen Feng and when?

Who was acting as Qu Hui and when?

How much did Mr. Xu really know about all of these electronic communications?

Which, if any, of those communications did he actually participate in?

If they were really seeking trade secrets, the folks at MSS, how could they believe that David Zheng, the GE engineer, was going to give them up, especially when he said repeatedly that he would not do so, especially when the government's star witness, Arthur Gao, never did so? Especially when star witness, Sun Li, never did so? Are you getting a trend here? They weren't looking for trade secret information.

The government has reached too far. They failed to prove their case. Not sure why precisely the FBI and GE are working so hard on this. Perhaps, though, perhaps we've seen an example of how far the feds will go to protect and advance the interest of one of their largest multinational corporations.

Sadly, as I mentioned before, there's a man who is caught in the middle, and that's not right. That's not justice. And when you look at this objectively, as you have sworn to do, as you have sworn an oath to do, you will conclude, as you must, that this one man -- full circle, this one man did not attempt to steal trade secrets. He did not conspire to steal trade

secrets. He did not do so knowingly, and he did not do so intentionally.

Ladies and gentlemen, the government has laid out their claims in the overt acts, and I just want to make sure that you understand that those are just their claims, and they're things that, if done separately, are perfectly legal and, when combined, are perfectly legal as well if the object was not inappropriate.

If there was any conspiracy on China's side, it was a conspiracy, a joint effort to obtain information that was free of trade secrets. And if you want to call that kind of joint effort a conspiracy, good for you.

You've taken an oath to find the facts based only on the evidence you've heard in this courtroom. You've heard and seen evidence for two weeks now. That's a lot of evidence. But when it comes to evidence, quantity does not equal quality, as I said over two weeks ago.

This case, the government's case, is a nearly random bunch of weak circumstantial evidence, a bunch of witnesses, too many witnesses, who offered little or no -- little or nothing toward the government's objective; and, frankly, at times, really only helped our cause, our case.

The government's case is not a strong case. It's a weak case, and you must acquit Mr. Xu when you apply the beyond a reasonable doubt standard.

Recall your instructions from Judge Black. In my opinion, the most important of those instructions is the proof beyond a reasonable doubt instruction at page 3 in your instructions.

Mr. Xu is presumed innocent, not guilty. In order to convict him, the government must overcome this strong presumption. They have not. They had to prove his guilt to each of you beyond a reasonable doubt; not beyond all doubt, but pretty close. They failed.

We, conversely, didn't need to prove anything. We didn't have to put on any evidence, and we chose not to because the government failed to meet their burden.

Remember, in order to convict, you have to find guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. So if you have any reasonable doubt about any of the elements which the government was required to prove, then you must do your duty, you must do the right thing, and you must vote not guilty. And you should do it on each of the four counts which the government, not the Court, has alleged against Mr. Xu.

There simply has not been enough reliable quality evidence presented in this case, not enough for you to do anything other than vote to acquit, vote not guilty.

Think, please, about Judge Black's admonitions. The only way you could vote to convict would be if you would base one of the most -- I'm sorry, the most important decision in your

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

life on the evidence that the government has presented here.

And don't forget the evidence that came out during cross-examination. You know, when the government takes on a knowingly case, when the government takes on an intentionally case -- that's what we sort of call them as criminal lawyers -- they must, as I said in my opening statement, I hope you'll recall, take you inside the defendant's head, inside the head of a man who lives literally one-half way around the world, who grew up and lives in a culture that we barely understand.

The government has failed to place you in his head. have failed to show you that Mr. Xu crossed the line that I mentioned earlier.

Folks, this is a man from China. If we, as a nation, are going to lure someone from a country halfway around the world to a third country, a friendly country, where we snatch him and we jail him, we need better facts than these. We need better evidence than this.

Our Constitution now grants him rights, as well it should. So our Constitution now quarantees that in order to find -- that the government has to prove Mr. Xu quilty beyond a reasonable doubt before this case goes any further. government has failed on all four counts to meet its burden of proof.

You must, each and every one of you, each and every one

```
1
      of you, follow your oath, examine the evidence, do your duty,
      and find Mr. Xu not quilty of Counts 1 through 4.
 2
 3
           Thank you for your attention.
           Your Honor, that concludes my remarks.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Very well. I'm inclined to take a break,
      unless there's an objection?
 6
 7
               MR. MANGAN: No, Your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: You've been listening carefully. You've
 9
      been focused, as you have since day one. I'm not quite done.
10
           The government gets the last word.
11
           We're going to break for 15 minutes, get you back in the
12
      courtroom at 4:00. The government will make its final closing
13
      remarks, and then I'm going to send you to the jury room
14
      briefly.
           Out of respect for you, we'll rise as you leave for
15
      15 minutes.
16
17
           (Jury out at 3:46 p.m.)
               THE COURT: The jury's left the room. We're going to
18
      break for 15 minutes. Come back on the record at 4:00.
19
20
           (Brief recess.)
21
               THE COURT: It's two minutes to 4:00. We're outside
22
      the presence of the jury.
23
           Are we ready for the jury for a rebuttal closing argument
24
      from the government's perspective?
25
               MR. MANGAN: Yes, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: And the defense? 1 2 MR. KOHNEN: Yes, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Let's call for the jury. (Jury in at 4:05 p.m.) 4 5 THE COURT: All members of the jury have joined us after the break. Thank you for your continuing attention. 6 7 We're going to hear the government's rebuttal closing, 8 their last word. 9 Mr. Mangan. 10 MR. MANGAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I appreciate your 11 12 attention, and I will try to be brief. So there were quite a number of things in there. I won't 13 address every single one. Obviously, you need to determine 14 15 what evidence you saw and what evidence you heard and whether 16 that convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt. But keep in mind it's based on the evidence in here, not 17 wishful thinking, not what they wish had happened in this 18 19 trial. It's based on the actual evidence that is right there 20 in the defendant's own writings. 21 Some of what you heard, I think, was more of an alternate reality, divorced from the evidence that you heard. 22 23 I do want to talk a little bit about he brought up a 24 point regarding, Hey, somebody's tried to get into the email

accounts after he was arrested. Well, bear in mind, he works

25

for the MSS. Let's keep that in mind. After he was arrested, the fact that there may have been IP hits going into his email account are not terribly unusual, and there were other explanations for that. But, again, that was just on the email accounts. It doesn't go back to everything else you heard about the attribution that takes all of the evidence right back to this defendant, okay?

When they went and talked about, well, you know, who is Qu Hui, who is the person behind the keyboard, that's what we tried to show you time and time again, that it was him.

The text messages are from his phone number. He was carrying that phone in Belgium. It's the same phone number he puts on the business card for his alias.

When we talk about the voice recordings, Arthur Gao was there. He listened to the recordings. Jason Wang, the linguist, listened to those recordings. They also had listened to the defendant. They said that's him, all right?

When they talked with Qu Hui about, "Hey, can we meet," and they set up a meeting in Belgium, who shows up is Qu Hui, the defendant. When David Zheng met him in China, got the business card and came into court and pointed him out and said that's him, there is no mystery to this. They are just trying to grab at whatever they can. It's desperation.

Now, one other thing I'd want to hit on. I know they mentioned -- they didn't talk a lot about it, but we talked

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

some about this hacking and the things that happened at Safran, what happened with the Eighth Division. And they said, well, you know, he's part of state security. Maybe it was state security.

Well, did you hear any evidence that that was part of some state security operation? Remember in the evidence, he said he deals with overseas science and technology. His job is dealing in aviation; and, lo and behold, the people that were hacked worked for aviation companies.

And they weren't Chinese citizens. These were individuals from other countries for the exchanges. They were invited there for these exchanges, and then they went and ripped off their computers while they were in a hotel room, all right?

And, frankly, it doesn't matter what name they want to put on it. If it meets the elements of the crime, it's the crime. They can call it whatever excuse they can, but the fact is, if you look at that evidence, whether it's the Eighth Division applying techniques, or them trying to get people like Sun Li to be a new asset, or it's frankly very clear the Safran hacking, in all circumstances, if you look at that evidence and understand, yes, this was a conspiracy with an attempt to obtain aviation trade secrets, then he is guilty. Period. End of story.

The one other thing I want to mention, I know there was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a -- you've heard the instructions this morning. You'll have a chance to go back and look at them.

There was a lot of talk about what was being targeted. want to be clear once again that you heard in the instructions that this is not -- you know, impossibility is not a defense.

It says in here the government must only prove that the conspiracy intended to target information that the conspirators believed to be trade secrets. Whether or not the targeted information actually was a trade secret is irrelevant, all right?

So when we go back to the facts and the evidence that was before you with GE, there's an awful lot in there for you to look at and to conclude that that, in fact, was his intent.

And what was interesting is Mr. Kohnen talked time and time again about this person was a star witness, and this person was a star witness. If there was a star in this case, and that's not kind of how we phrase things, but in the evidence, the star is Xu Yanjun. It's his words through almost every piece of evidence in there. He is the speaker. He is the one talking to you and telling you what his intent is. So he is the star. And you need to look at what he said and how that is a window into his intent.

So much of what you just heard in the response talked about other people, other people, other people, and they didn't want to touch on what Xu Yanjun said because it's

incriminating, because it's -- they're admissions. It shows his guilt time and time again.

He gives away his intent with his words. You saw it over and over again in the Gao recording, when he talks about trying to obtain stuff that's secret at these companies, in the GE incident, over and over again.

They skipped over most of what happened in 2018 in the GE. Think about that. Most of what we are trying to present to you involved what this defendant said and solicited and demanded of the GE employee through 2018, and they didn't touch it. They didn't want to talk about it because there's not much to say.

When he goes to him and says go ahead and collect, I want domes- -- you know, we want this stuff regarding the system requirements, then he gives some more detail on it, then he finally sends the list with the domestic requirements.

And, by the way, that was -- there was a lot of talk about Mr. Kray saying this stuff gets to GE information. It was the domestic requirements list that he looked at, where it goes through in grave detail about the various measurements and things of that nature, where he says yes, the answers to this are getting at our trade secrets.

Those were the lists from Xu Yanjun, from his own words that he gave to the defendant, and he doubled down and he asked for the directory. When he got the directory, he

doubled down and asked, "Hey, can you bring it?" Then he said once again, "Don't just bring it. Can you export it? Can you download it on to a hard drive?"

He showed you his intent time and time again. And then he traveled thousands and thousands of miles into Belgium with all the cash and everything else, and the phones and the pictures, and the questions and the hard drives because he wanted to get that computer, and he surely intended to obtain those trade secrets at that point.

Again, we ask you to use your common sense when looking at the evidence in this case. Above all, use your common sense, look at the circumstances and look very carefully at the defendant's words because, as we said before, what he hides with his aliases, what he hides with his lies, shows you his intent, but then also what he says shows you his intent.

You saw it from the Gao recordings through all of the GE materials and the way he talked privately with his coconspirators.

If you want one more thing, look at the recording when he was speaking with his tutor. These are his own words. This is his recording, his voice that was identified by witnesses, "The leadership asked you to get the materials of a U.S. F-22 fighter aircraft. You can't get it by sitting at home."

He's telling you what his job is. He's telling you what he does for a living. And when his friend says, "You also have

to flip someone. Travel outside China and take the risk."

Couldn't have predicted any better. That's exactly what he tried to do here with GE.

I know they want to blame the victim, blame GE. GE's just trying to sell engines without getting ripped off, but he was the one targeting GE. He's the one targeting this GE composites engineer. He tried to flip them. He thought he was going to flip them, and he took the risk, and this is where the consequences are.

Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, momentarily, it's time to begin your deliberations. I recognize that it's about 4:15. The first thing I need to do before we send you upstairs is do something I've never enjoyed doing.

I've been a judge for more than 25 years. I told you up front that we picked three alternates because this trial was scheduled to go on for a long period of time, and we were concerned, as we are in all cases, that we could lose some jurors over that time period. We have not lost any jurors. We need to reduce this jury to 12 people, so I need to excuse the three alternates.

In excusing you, I want you to understand, number one, you remain on jury duty. Don't go to work. If one of the 12 jurors is unavailable, we're going to pick up the phone and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

call an alternate to scurry down. So make yourself available by phone that Ms. Webster has, and if we need you, we'll call you.

But until the verdict is reached by the original 12, you're not to discuss the case with anyone. That admonition stands because if you go home and talk about it now, and then we call you back, you've had a conversation outside the presence of the Court that you would bring to the jury deliberations, which would be inappropriate.

So as difficult as it is, continue not to discuss the case with anyone. No independent research. We'll call you when a verdict has been reached. At that point, you're free to discuss the case with anyone. You are also free to choose not to discuss the case with anyone.

So I'm going to excuse the three alternates now with my sincere thanks on behalf of the Court and the community for your continuing service, for your having sat here through and listening to every word, and now being asked to go home and not discuss it until the verdict is reached in the event we need to call you.

The three alternates are Jurors 15, 14, and 13. going to come down and greet you on behalf of the Court and community, the work you have done and are continuing to do.

If 15, 14, and 13 would stand and prepare to leave the room. If you'll lead them around, I want to bump your elbow. This is on behalf of the Court and community. Do you bump? Thank you.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you.

You're free to go.

To the 12 of you in the jury box, you are the jury. You are to decide this case. You are to follow the instructions.

Momentarily, I'm going to send you up to the jury room. As I indicated in the instructions, the first thing you should do is pick a foreperson. That person has no extra power and no better vote.

That person is merely designed to make sure that all 12 of you get to express your opinions whenever you want and to speak for you to the Court if you need to speak to the Court.

After you pick a foreperson, you can decide among yourselves how long you want to stay today, or whether you want to adjourn at the normal time or shortly thereafter, go home, get refreshed, and come back tomorrow at 9:15 for us to get you back on the job at 9:30.

You're welcome to take as much time or as many days as you choose.

When you come back tomorrow, if that's how it works out, you're to go to the jury room at 9:15 but not discuss the case. At 9:30, I will call for you to come back to the courtroom. I'll count noses. I'll send you right back

upstairs and you begin your deliberations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I just don't want deliberations to start before all 12 have gathered and before you have seen me.

We'll send upstairs today your jury instruction packets and one verdict form. The verdict form has my initials on it so I know it's the one, your jury instructions. Some of you took notes. You'll have to figure out among yourselves which packet is yours and which is not. We will also send up the exhibits.

Today after you've gone upstairs and you've selected a foreperson and you've decided how much you want to stay today, buzz for us. I'll send someone up. I'll get your directions whether you want to leave at the time of the buzzer, or whether you want to stay later tonight, or whether you want to come back tomorrow and start fresh in the jury room by 9:15. No discussions. Back to the courtroom at 9:30. Then right back upstairs and you continue your deliberations.

So here you are. You're about to exercise the sacrifice required by democracy. We don't live in a country where a king decides guilt or innocence. We live in a country where 12 ordinary citizens come down, listen to the evidence, and collectively reach a decision.

It's on your shoulders. It's an enormous responsibility, but it's a sacrifice required by democracy. And I've watched you, and I have enormous faith in your abilities.

```
1
           Out of respect for you, we'll rise as you go to the jury
 2
      room. Pick a foreperson, buzz us when you know what you want
 3
      to do for the balance of the day.
           If you'd rise as the jury leaves.
 4
 5
           (Jury out at 4:22 p.m.)
 6
                THE COURT: The jury has left the courtroom.
 7
      door is closing.
 8
           You've heard my instructions to the jury. I anticipate
 9
      hearing from them soon, and we will advise you and them as to
10
      where we are.
11
           Court's in recess until we hear from the jury.
12
           (Brief recess.)
13
                THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated.
14
           Back in the courtroom on the record. The jury is
15
      upstairs. It's a few minutes after 4:30.
           The defense team is here with the defendant and
16
      interpreters.
17
18
           The government team is here.
19
           I'm advised that the jury has selected a foreperson and
20
      wishes to go home for the day, go home and start fresh.
21
           I intend to call them down here, admonish them, as is
22
      traditionally done, and release them for the day.
23
           Is there anything for me before we call the jurors down
24
      from the government?
25
               MR. MANGAN: No, Your Honor.
```

```
THE COURT: From the defense?
 1
 2
               MR. KOHNEN: No, Your Honor, except to ask who -- do
 3
      you expect any of us here tomorrow morning at 9:30?
               THE COURT: Yes. I'm going to bring the jury to the
 4
 5
      room every morning at 9:30. I think it would be helpful if
      you were -- if somebody on behalf of both sides were present.
 6
 7
           Do you wish to have your client present?
 8
               MR. KOHNEN: May I consult with him for a moment?
 9
               THE COURT: Yes.
10
           (Mr. Kohnen confers with the defendant.)
11
               MR. KOHNEN: Your Honor, I think they're probably
12
      going to bring him down here daily anyway, so the answer is
13
      yes.
14
               THE COURT: Very well. So the marshall is advised
      that we'll need the defendant tomorrow in the courtroom at
15
      9:15, ready for the jury at 9:30, which will get sent back to
16
17
      the jury room at about 9:32.
           Is there anything further from the defense before we get
18
19
      the jury?
20
               MR. KOHNEN: No. Thank you, Judge.
21
               THE COURT: The government?
22
               MR. MANGAN: No, Your Honor.
23
               THE COURT: Please call for the jury.
24
           (Jury in at 4:38 p.m.)
25
               THE COURT: You may all be seated. Thank you.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All 12 jurors have returned to the courtroom. I'm advised that you have selected a foreperson and that you wish to leave for the day -- it's after 4:30 -- come back tomorrow morning to pick up with deliberations. And that makes eminent good sense.

I brought you down here one more time to give you the standard admonitions. This is really important. Do not discuss the case during the break with anyone, including among a couple of yourselves.

We're done talking about the case, you are, until we bring you back to the courthouse. You'll go to the jury room by 9:15. I'll call for you at 9:30. I'll count 12 and send you back up to begin your deliberations.

Don't talk about the case until I've seen you and sent you back upstairs.

On behalf of the Court and the community one more time, thank you for your hard work and your service.

Do not discuss the case with anyone, including among yourselves. Do not discuss the case tomorrow until you've come to the courtroom and I've sent you upstairs. No independent research.

Thank you. You're free to go for the day. We'll rise for you as you leave for the day.

(Jury out at 4:40 p.m.)

THE COURT: The jury has left for the day. The door

```
has closed.
 1
 2
           Are we ready to adjourn for the day, or is there anything
 3
      else you want to address at this time from the government?
               MR. MANGAN: No, Your Honor.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: You'll be here tomorrow morning?
               MR. MANGAN: Yes. We will be here.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: Defense, anything further for today?
 8
               MR. KOHNEN: Ditto, Judge Black. Thank you.
 9
               THE COURT: All right. We'll see you tomorrow.
10
      We're in recess.
11
                (Proceedings adjourned at 4:40 p.m.)
12
13
                       CERTIFICATE
14
           I, M. SUE LOPREATO, RMR, CRR, certify that the foregoing
15
      is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the
16
      above-entitled matter.
17
                                               February 1, 2022
18
      /s/ M. Sue Lopreato
      M. SUE LOPREATO, RMR, CRR
19
      Official Court Reporter
20
21
22
23
24
2.5
```